

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of board of supervisors of Alameda County, Calif., favoring the establishment of a United States naval academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of William Hoesfoll Post, No. 90, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring bill to increase pensions of all Civil War soldiers to \$50 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of Polish Alma Mater, Chicago, Ill., and the Polish Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill., opposing Senate bill 2099; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of Arthur C. Davis and many other former soldiers, of Mobile, Ala., for an increase in bonus to soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KREIDER: Petition of citizens of Carlisle, Pa., to repeal the tax on sodas, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Fox's Meat Market, George R. Plater & Co., and the American Credit & Collection Co., of Baltimore, and E. G. Wheeler & Son, of Glyndon, all in the State of Maryland, opposing the passage of Senate bill 2202, known as the Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of James F. McDonald, C. Augustus Bauer, Benjamin F. Sillers, Harry D. Delcher, Walter M. Gees, all of the Journeymen Bookbinders' Union, Washington, D. C., and Arthur Scofield, William W. Wallace, Sylvester F. Carman, John B. Ranch, Montford L. Ellis, Harry B. Rohrbaugh, Frank B. Helm, William H. Hagner, all of the Printing Pressmen's Union, Washington, D. C., urging support of House bill 5418; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of one citizen of Maryland, urging support of Mason resolution providing for appropriation for a diplomatic representative to Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of A. J. Pattie, Baltimore, Md., protesting against wording of prohibition bills regarding flavoring extracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Common Council of the city of Bridgeport, Conn., for the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, protesting against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of New York Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, asking that the flagship *Hartford* be associated always with the achievements of the Nation's great admiral, Farragut; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 2202; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill 7686, claim of Eli Pettijohn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of Ed. H. Beeswick and 99 other other residents of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the repeal of the war tax on candy, ice cream, and soda fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of B. T. Bush, of New York, against the Kenyon bill (S. 2202); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the International Federation of Draftsmen's Union, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing a suitable civil-service retirement law; also a statement of principles as advanced by the National Council of American Patriots, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of American Federation of Labor in opposition to mob rule and lynching; National Federation of Federal Employees protesting against Representative Good's amendment to the Nolan minimum-wage bill for Government employees; Milk Producers' Association, Modesto, Calif., and California Associated Raisin Co., indorsing Senator Capper's amendment to the antitrust law; and the Visalia Commercial Club, Visalia, Calif., requesting the rescinding of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of B. T. Bush, of New York, opposing the Kenyon bill (S. 2202); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Rochester Branch, No. 210, National Association of Letter Carriers, and Local 215, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, asking immediate increase in salary effective July 1, 1919, of at least 50 per cent over and above present temporary wage scale, to continue in effect until report of the committee on the readjustment of salaries of post-office employees is received; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 23, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee as representatives of this great Nation pledged to justice and peace. We deplore the expression of bitterness and hate that has disgraced the streets of our National Capital in the last few days. We thank Thee that this is the exhibition of but the smallest fraction of the great multitude of Thy people in this country of ours, who love justice and right. We pray that Thou wilt strengthen the arm of the law, that Thou wilt give the hand of justice to those who deal with lawbreakers, that Thou wilt guide and protect those who defend the rights and liberties of the people. Do Thou bring out of these expressions that arise a deeper sense of our dependence upon God and of our league with Thee for the establishment of peace in all the earth. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

FOREST FIRES IN IDAHO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, which will be read.

The communication was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 22, 1919.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Forest fires of unusual intensity and extent prevail in Idaho. Some of these are on the unreserved public lands, while some are on forest reserves and some on private lands. I have authorized Mr. Tallman, the Commissioner of Public Lands, to draw upon the moneys appropriated for the field service in the Land Office for funds with which to fight these fires. This is a matter of the gravest emergency, and already we have specifically allotted \$40,000 for this work; but this will be quite insufficient. It seems to me a matter of such vital importance that I take the liberty of suggesting that a joint resolution should be passed through both Houses authorizing an expenditure up to the amount of \$500,000, which should contain an authorization for the reimbursement of the field-service fund, which was not intended by Congress for any such purpose except perhaps in some very minor amount. The latest word from our agents in Idaho is that all that can be done is to keep the fires from spreading over a much wider territory and that they can not be extinguished save by a heavy rain, of which there is no immediate prospect.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

ISSUANCE OF RAILROAD PASSES (S. DOC. NO. 57).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Director General of Railroads, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 8th instant, information relative to the issuance of annual all-line railroad sleeping-car, parlor-car, and dining-car passes issued during the period of Federal control, which will be printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NEWBERRY. The communication just laid before the Senate by the Chair is in response to a resolution offered by myself, and I ask that it be printed in the Record.

The communication is as follows:

UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 22, 1919.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With regard to the resolution adopted by the Senate on July 8, calling upon the Director General of Railroads to report certain facts in connection with annual all-line railroad sleeping-car, parlor-car, and dining-car passes issued during the period of Federal control, preparation of facts desired was begun immediately upon receipt of the resolution. In view of the detailed nature of the information requested, the facts can not be presented immediately, but pending a complete report, I thought I should submit to the Senate the facts along general lines.

No passes are issued for free dining-car service.

In issuing passes good on railroads under Federal operation and good for sleeping-car and parlor-car accommodations, the Railroad Administration has been guided by the established practices which had been adopted under private control in conformity with the provisions adopted by Congress in the interstate commerce act and in amendments thereto, governing the matter of free passes.

Under private control, it was the general practice for the principal railroad officers to have annual passes on their own railroads and in addition to obtain exchange passes from practically all other railroads in the country, so far as they might be applied for. The result was that each of these general railroad officers had a large number of annual passes covering most of the important mileage in the country. In addition the chief managing officers very frequently had annual Pullman passes good on all Pullman lines in the United States. The officers who had annual passes for themselves on the railroads generally also had annual railroad and Pullman passes for the dependent members of their families, or could and did obtain trip passes as a matter of course upon request.

The general policy of the Railroad Administration was to take these established practices as its standard and on that basis to give passes good on all lines only on account of representatives of the central administration and on account of such railroad officers as had customarily had available to them annual passes good on practically all mileage under Federal control.

Annual passes good over all lines have been issued broadly to the following classes of persons:

Officials of the central administration which, of course, has jurisdiction over all lines.

The seven regional directors and the principal members of their staffs.

The Federal managers of the various railroads and other officials who under private control had at their disposal passes on any line desired, such officers under private control having, generally speaking, held exchange passes over practically all railroads in the United States, or over all such railroads might be included in their request for passes.

The chief executives of the railroad corporations (including the chief officers of the Association of Railroad Executives and the secretary of the American Railroad Association), such chief executives having had under private control passes over all railroads, or over such railroads as they might include in their requests therefor.

Dependent members of the families of the foregoing persons.

The chief officers of the American Short Line Association, Western Railroad Association, Railway Accounting Officers' Association, Association of Transportation and Car Accounting Officers, and Association of Western Railroads.

Nearly 98 per cent of the all-line passes issued by the Railroad Administration are restricted so as not to be good on certain specified limited trains.

Pullman passes good on all lines have been issued, broadly, to many members of the same classes mentioned above.

All-line railroad passes have been issued by the Railroad Administration to 4,114 persons during the period of Federal control, of which 119 have been canceled in the regular order of business, leaving 3,995 outstanding on July 1, 1919; all-line Pullman passes have been issued to 2,418 persons by the Railroad Administration during Federal control, of which 515 have been canceled, leaving 1,903 outstanding on July 1, 1919. All of these passes have been issued in accordance with the foregoing standards.

Sincerely, yours,

WALKER D. HINES,
Director General of Railroads.

GENERAL STAFF CORPS—MEDALS OF HONOR (S. DOC. NO. 58).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 14th instant, copies of all reports, memoranda, etc., on file or of record in Washington, D. C., under the control of the War Department and relate to the interpretation and execution of the provisions of section 5 and of section 122 of the national-defense act, approved June 3, 1916, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MOSES presented a petition of Mechanic Lodge, No. 23, International Order of Good Templars, of East Weare, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of war-time and national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Milan, Madbury, Hollis, Chichester, Strafford, and New Durham, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SPENCER. I present two telegrams, one from the Grand Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of Missouri, and the other from the St. Louis Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in regard to the mob riots in this city. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., July 22, 1919.

HON. SELDEN P. SPENCER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Grand Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of Missouri, in convention assembled, representing 15,000 members, citizens from all parts of Missouri, protests against the shameful and lawless actions by mobs of civilians and soldiers, disgracing the Capital of the Nation by the slaughter of negro citizens. We urge you as a representative of the people of Missouri, in the name of humanity, justice, freedom, and security, to invoke the power of the Government to stop this lawlessness and establish and maintain the rule and supremacy of law.

A. W. LLOYD, Grand Chancellor.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., July 23, 1919.

HON. SELDEN P. SPENCER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The St. Louis Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, is horrified at the shameful actions of the mobs of civilians and soldiers which are disgracing the Nation by the wanton slaughter of negro citizens. We urge you to use every effort to have the Government put an end to this mob murder and to establish law and order.

GEO. L. VAUGHN,
Chairman Executive Committee.

Mr. LENROOT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wauwatosa, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of war-time and national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present the petitions of Mrs. Curtis Guild, Elinor Blanchard, Margaret F. Motley, Amy Gray, Harriet S. Motley, Maria P. Trumbull, and 68 other residents of Nahant; of Mary Brandegee, Eleanor M. Sears, and Pauline Danielson, of Boston; of Ruth A. Wendell and Bayard Tuckerman, of Ipswich; of Edith C. Ames, of North Easton; of Gertrude H. Whitwell, of Milton; of Beatrice Bill Talbot, of Wianno; of J. H. Hunnewell, of Wellesley; of Gertrude Adamowski, of West Manchester; and E. T. Coolidge, of Prides Crossing, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying that in the enactment of legislation restricting immigration into the United States domestic female servants be allowed entrance. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented memorials of 919 employees of the Crompton & Knowles Loom Works, of Worcester; also of employees of the A. E. Little Co. and of the Reed & Prince Manufacturing Co., of Worcester; of the Bay State Saw & Tool Manufacturing Co., of Worcester; of E. W. Burt & Co. (Inc.), of Lynn; of the Chaffee Bros. Co., of Oxford; of the Hampden Toy Co., of Westfield; of the A. Burlingame Co., of Worcester; of John D. Young & Sons Co., of Boston; of Ashworth Bros. (Inc.), of Fall River; of the Palmer Carpet Mill, of the J. E. Torrey Razor Co., of Worcester; of the Parks-Cramer Co., of Fitchburg; of the Walker Vehicle Co., of R. Blackinton & Co., of North Attleboro; of the G. W. Bent Co., of Boston; of the Standard Thermometer Co., of Boston; of the Millers Falls Tool Co., of the F. H. Thomas Co., of Boston; of Myrton O. Hill & Co., of the Russia Cement Co., of Gloucester; of the Winthrop Cotton Yarn Co., of Taunton; of the Thompson-Crocker Shoe Co., of the New England Pressed Steel Co., of Natick; of the Jewett Piano Co., of Leominster; of the Van Tassel Tanning Co., of Stoneham; of the Northampton Silk Co., of Florence; of Fairclough & Gold (Inc.), of the Woodward & Powell Planer Co., of Worcester; of the Henry W. Breed Co., of Lynn; of the Lowe Bros. Co., of Boston; and of the Boston & Lockport Block Co., of East Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of Local Union No. 511, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Topeka, Kans., praying for Government ownership and control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of the commissioner of education of Porto Rico, praying for the enactment of legislation to aid in the public education of the children of Porto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of sundry teacher students of the Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Local Grange No. 380, Patrons of Husbandry, of Gazelle, Calif., and a petition of Local Union No. 155, Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, of Pasadena, Calif., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HARRISON presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Miss., relative to the death of James D. McDonald, a volunteer member of the Expeditionary Forces in France, who lost his life in the service of his country, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Natchez, Miss., praying for the enactment of legislation creating a civil-service engineer corps with a military status to be under the direction and orders of the Chief of Engineers, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. STERLING. I am directed by the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, to which was referred the bill (S. 1699) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 99) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. McLEAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 170) to amend section 25 of the act of December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act of September 7, 1916, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 100) thereon.

AMBASSADOR TO BELGIUM.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 75) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Belgium, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate as in Committee of the Whole proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, as the representative of the United States, an ambassador to the Kingdom of Belgium, who shall receive as compensation the sum of \$17,500 per annum.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. KNOX. From the Committee on Rules I submit a report to which I call the attention of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I gave the necessary notice when I submitted the resolution for an amendment of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Therefore I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and is hereby, amended as follows:

After the words "to the Committee on Military Affairs" insert "the Diplomatic and Consular Service bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations."

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRBY:

A bill (S. 2594) to extend the time for the construction of the Broadway Street Bridge across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 2595) to extend the time for the construction of the Main Street Bridge across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 2596) to promote the efficiency of the permanent Military Establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 2597) to prevent the artificial stimulation of the export of immigrants' savings through propaganda, foreign subsidies, and the agencies of foreign Governments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2598) to carry into effect findings of the Court of Claims made in favor of Isabella G. Francis, administratrix of the estate of Roger A. Francis, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2599) for the relief of Charles D. Shay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2600) for the relief of John Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2601) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2602) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2603) granting a pension to Mary L. Bryant; to the Committee on Pensions.

REGULATION OF AERIAL NAVIGATION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I introduce a bill, which I send to the desk, to regulate the navigation of the air.

The bill (S. 2593) to regulate the navigation of the air was read twice by its title.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a couple of minutes to present on this subject the reasons why I have introduced the bill. It is a subject which has heretofore not been covered by any legislation.

On July 21, 1919, 10 persons were killed and more than 25 seriously injured, some fatally, when a large dirigible balloon in a flight above the city of Chicago fell 500 feet, with its heavy motors and filled gasoline tanks crashing through the glass roof of the Illinois Trust & Savings Bank at the corner of La Salle Street and Jackson Boulevard. Most of the dead and injured were employees of the bank, who were trapped and

burned to death in a resulting fire from the explosion of the balloon's gasoline tanks as they struck the floor of the bank rotunda, where more than 200 bookkeepers and clerks, nearly all girls, were working. A flame of gasoline enveloped the workers, some of whom were literally burned to death and charred beyond recognition when their bodies were recovered. Last week an airplane in another State fell in a field or orchard, killing members of a farmer's family. Accidents of the foregoing character are multiplying rapidly throughout the country. It is evident an emergency is rapidly approaching in the navigation of aircraft requiring proper regulations. To that end I have prepared the bill offered this morning as a basis for action. I do not submit it as a perfected measure. It is only the foundation for the Senate and House to concentrate their opinion upon and mature it into a workable measure as speedily as may be consistent with the due course of legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING BEVERAGES.

Mr. PHELAN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—H. F. HARRINGTON.

On motion of Mr. WALSH of Montana, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill S. 815, Fifty-eighth Congress, first session, granting a pension to H. F. Harrington, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have a short editorial taken from the American, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., a nonpartisan paper. I ask that it be printed in the Record without reading.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

"Those followers of the President who, irrespective of party affiliation, have looked upon him as the leading liberal force of the world can have been only supremely disappointed in his message yesterday to Congress, in which he was to render an accounting of his activities in making the peace.

"America asked for facts and obtained fine phrases.

"America asked for straightforwardness and obtained indirection and hypocrisy.

"They were the words of a man who has been up against the system and came out somewhat raveled.

"Now, it is furthest from the thought of all true Americans to be unfair or to take advantage of the President while he is defending, in a partisan political fight, the peace which he has brought back with him from Paris.

"It is unfortunate that this fight is forced upon Mr. Wilson in the way that it has been. We can have no sympathy with those battling old reactionaries who are leading the attack in the Senate upon the peace.

"America has entered into international politics. America has responsibilities in that way to-day which it can not dodge. The vague generalities of Mr. Wilson will do us no good. What we want to do is to look the facts directly in the eye and appraise them for what they are.

"We can not blame Mr. Wilson for failing in Paris. We do blame him for denying that failure. And we should know where to place that blame. We should be acquainted with the forces which brought about this condition by which America is robbed of the fruits of a war which it fought with all the valor of its gallant manhood and for ideals higher than any nation ever battled for.

"We can not subscribe to the half confession in Mr. Wilson's message that ideals are impossible of realization. For in that way lies destruction and despair.

"Mr. Wilson is a tired man. He has battled hard, no doubt. But we believe the people of the United States have balance enough to accept and pass judgment with the spirit of whole justice, and all that they want is an opportunity to be permitted access to the facts. Mr. Wilson in his message withheld all facts. And that was where his message was a failure and a confession that his mission was a failure.

"The country now is confronted with two courses. One is to reject the treaty, and the other is to accept it, in the hope

that it may prove the basis, through public opinion, of attaining the ideals of the war at some future date.

"Mr. Wilson's wisest course would have been open confession that such was the one hope of the peace. His error is in contending that it is a success as it stands, for the people will not believe it.

"Mr. Wilson's assertion that the treaty squares with his principles is a challenge to the intelligence of the country. Of course he qualifies that statement by saying 'so far as possible' under the 'existing' international situations.

"The terms of the armistice specified the Allies were willing to make peace with Germany on the basis of President Wilson's address of January 8, 1918 (the 14 points), and 'subsequent addresses.'

"On September 27, 1918, the President said: 'The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just.'

"Mr. Wilson can hardly successfully maintain that this peace squares with that principle. And again he said:

"There can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the league and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the league of nations as a means of discipline and control."

"Now, under this treaty, which Mr. Wilson so naively contends squares with his principles, the most rigid, iron-clad economic boycott of Germany is perpetuated, its execution is in the hands, practically speaking, of French and English bankers and manufacturers, through the one-sided prohibition against German tariff walls, the control of the German railway and sea transport system, and the device of no limit on reparations, which makes the reparations commission the real governing power of Germany for the next generation.

"Thus, in fact, the peace congress has played the rôle of conquest, behind its fine and disguised pretensions, with all the vigor and effectiveness of another kaiser.

"Arguments that the peace is justified because it is the kind of peace that Germany would have made are the refuge of the dishonest. We fought the war to end that kind of peace, and promised otherwise to a revolutionary Germany.

"Mr. Wilson points out in his address that Paris had to contend with the system of international politics, which aroused many difficulties.

"And there is the crux of the situation.

"The duty of Mr. Wilson and the conferees at Paris was to wipe out the old order.

"Good will and the courage to stand against imperialists at home as the soldiers stood against the imperialists in the field of battle were lacking, we read between the lines in the message. It is not the kind of peace that America would have made, Mr. Wilson declares. Isn't that a confession of failure?

"The armistice was based on the President's 14 points and his 'subsequent addresses.' Mr. Wilson was the voice and the executive of America. In other words, didn't the 'necessary' compromises of which Mr. Wilson speaks emasculate the ideals which Mr. Wilson so eloquently portrayed, and which were the force that drove the Allies to victory?

"Mr. Wilson, as usual, spoke in generalities. He confined his address to a résumé of the task that confronted the American delegates before they sailed for Paris. In giving an accounting of his stewardship it would have been better, had it been possible, to have been more specific regarding the fruits of those parleys which he contends were the best to be obtained.

"And we would like to know how Mr. Wilson squares the following with his principles:

"Is this a treaty of peace 'openly arrived at'?

"Private international understandings, were to be wiped out; yet the President comes back from Paris with a proposal that France and America enter into one.

"And how about the private understanding by which Japan assumes control over 40,000,000 inhabitants of Shantung in China, a country that was not an enemy power, but was in the war on the side of the Allies?

"And how about 'the removal of economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions'?

"Is not Germany one of the nations 'consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance'? Then, why is Germany excluded from the league?

"Did not the fourteenth point define the proposed league of nations as 'a general association of nations,' not as the allied alliance which it is? The league could not be formed during the war, the President declared in his last address before the armistice, because it would be 'merely a new alliance confined

to the nations associated against a common enemy.' Is the war still in progress?

"Adequate guaranties" were demanded on the subject of armaments. Where have those guaranties been applied? Not even wisely to the enemy powers. Germany is permitted to maintain conscription because France fears the effect of such a precedent!

"And we have yet to hear of any guaranty on armaments to be applied to America or any other allied power that might be termed 'adequate.' Yet Mr. Wilson now says this clause was to apply only to 'mischievous nations.' Would we consider Japan a mischievous nation? How does it apply there? And is not the practice of conscription enough to make any nation 'mischievous'? Does not it still make Germany mischievous?

"There were to be no annexations. The effective annexation of the Saar by the French, despite the hypocritical denials that such is the effect, is a very evident violation of that principle if we look no further.

"What we seek is the reign of law, based on the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind," said the President on July 4, 1918.

"Do the settlements regarding the Saar, the splicing of millions of Germans in Bohemia and Austria on Czechoslovakia, and others in Silesia, West Prussia, and Posen on Poland, and those others who go to Italy, contribute to 'a reign of law based on the consent of the governed'?

"Does Mr. Wilson contend that we have not 'discriminated between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just'?

"America can not see in these arrangements the 'minor compromises' which Mr. Wilson mentions. It is these 'minor' compromises which have bred war throughout history.

"This was to be a peace that was to end war. America will not swallow Mr. Wilson's pretense that it is a success."

REPEAL OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, various phases of the daylight-saving law have been considered by this and the other legislative body. I have received the following communication presenting another angle to the discussion. I should like to have it inserted in the Record. I ask unanimous consent that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

1327 NINTH STREET EAST,
Salt Lake City, Utah, July 14, 1919.

Senator WILLIAM H. KING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the matter of the repeal of the daylight-saving bill, I wonder if anyone has presented the view of the mother with small children to get off to school. I have four, and at an early time in the season I must begin getting them up almost before daylight to get them off to school on time. They are so rushed and hurried they will seldom eat their breakfast properly, and almost every day report a large number of tardy pupils in their rooms.

I have talked with a great many mothers and teachers on the subject, and almost without exception they have felt that the daylight-saving plan was a burden, intolerable, except for the fact that it was a war measure.

If you could get them (the children) to bed an hour earlier, it might be different, but you can not arbitrarily change a child's bedtime, and a little later it is too light and warm for them to go to bed at the proper time by the clock. After the children are rushed off helterskelter by 8 o'clock, "Heaven's time," the mother has all the little chores to do herself which might have been done by them in another hour.

If it would really help some "poor, down-trodden, laboring man," it would be different, but none of them work more than eight or nine hours a day, and shops are not kept open late at night as they were in Benjamin Franklin's time. There isn't a laboring man in the country who puts in as many hours a day as a mother with small children.

I sincerely hope the repeal will be passed over President Wilson's veto—and I voted for him, too.

Respectfully,

ETHEL R. CARLQUIST.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I make an inquiry of the Senator from Utah? I fear that the writer of this letter does not see how the repeal of the daylight-saving law will interfere with afternoon golf playing. It takes an act of Congress to get a golf player out of bed an hour earlier in the morning. I beg the Senate will consider that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PROPAGANDA ON PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have here a number of letters protesting against the passage of the Kenyon-Kendrick bill in the Senate and the Anderson bill, so called, in the House; one by the Hon. Joseph S. Peery, one of the leading citizens of my State; one by Mr. George Prentice; one by Mr. Parsons; and one by Mr. Kerr. I ask that the letter from Mr. Peery and the

one from Mr. Parsons be printed in the RECORD, and that all be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the two indicated were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, July 16, 1919.

HON. WILLIAM H. KING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been in the sheep business in Utah for the last 20 years and am not connected, directly or indirectly, with any packing house, stockyards, or live-stock commission business.

Believing that the Kenyon and Kendrick bills of the Senate and the Anderson bill of the House will be body blows against the live-stock business, I hereby protest against those bills and petition you to use your influence against their passage.

I believe this is the opinion of the sheepmen generally of the intermountain States.

Yours, respectfully,

JOSEPH S. PEERY.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, July 16, 1919.

HON. WILLIAM H. KING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I feel that I would be neglecting my duty to the stock growers of the West if I failed to do what little I could to call the attention of Congress through you and others to the danger which is to be found in two bills which have been introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, one known as the Kenyon bill, introduced June 23, 1919 (S. 2202, 66th Cong., 1st sess.), and the other as the Kendrick bill, introduced the same day (S. 2199), both entitled "A bill to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes." A similar bill to the Kenyon bill, and known as the Anderson bill, was introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

After reading the bills carefully I consider the titles misleading, or it may be that the two words "other purposes" may be the better title, which means the tearing down of a great industry which it has taken 50 years or more to build, without any possible chance of bettering the condition of the business, and if carried out to finality it would mean higher costs to the consumer, inferior production and service, besides tremendous waste of finished product.

The Kenyon bill is by far the most radical, and it seems to me that it is simply vicious in its terms. Both bills are vicious, radical, and absolutely socialistic in their effect.

I feel that the Kenyon bill is the result of the crusade of Francis J. Heney against the packing-house industry, in which he, as usual, conducted an unfair, sensational examination unsupported by the facts, but supported by newspaper propaganda.

I do not want to tire you with going over ground with which you are undoubtedly familiar, but why should the Government seek to tear down and control one of the greatest industries of this country which it has taken more than half a century to build up to its present efficient standard? If it is right and lawful in this case, why not in every other branch of private business? If it can be defended in one, it can in every other trade, business, or profession.

It seems to me that instead of being progressive measures they are decidedly the reverse, and, as before stated, socialistic in the extreme. They seem to want to divorce the packing houses from all other interests of any nature, such as cold-storage plants, ownership of refrigerator cars and ownership of stockyards' stock, and many other lines which are the direct outgrowth of the packing industry.

I want you to understand that I am not defending the packers. There may be instances where they have injured the public through the power in their hands, but it is my candid opinion that they are better serving the public to-day than it would be possible for that same public to be served through the channels indicated in these measures. Take the matter of refrigerator cars: Why should they be deprived of ownership of this equipment, which is more a part of the economical handling and distribution than any other part of the machinery of their organization? What would these gentlemen say if it were proposed to take the ownership of the Pullman cars from that company and say that the railroad companies must own and operate their own cars in that branch of their service? I doubt very much whether it would be possible for this great industry to carry on their business if the ownership of these cars were taken away from them. They certainly could never give the same service.

If either of these bills passed and the control of the packing houses and stockyards should be turned over to the incompetent handling that would follow through the inexperienced hands of Government clerks and red tape of bureau administration, would it stimulate production, sale, or distribution of live-stock products? The principle is wrong in its inception, and all the regulating that can be brought to bear would not make it right.

I hope and believe that you will look into this matter very carefully and do whatever you can to prevent the passage of either of the bills, and especially the Kenyon bill.

Yours, very truly,

M. K. PARSONS.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. President, I did not object to the request of the Senator from Utah, but I hope it will not be used as a precedent. If all the protests by telegram, by letter, and by petition, which are now being sent to Washington by the packers and through their propaganda are to be placed in the RECORD our need for paper will come very nearly exhausting the contingent expense appropriation of the Senate.

MR. KING. I hope the Senator from Colorado does not mean to intimate by anything he just said that the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned are representatives of the packers, because they are not.

MR. THOMAS. I do not mean to intimate anything of the sort, but I do mean to say that thousands of the best-meaning men and women in the country are being persuaded to write telegrams and letters to Senators and Representatives protesting against the Kenyon bill. I have letters and telegrams by the

score every day from men and women of the best intentions, good citizens, most of whom, I am satisfied, know no more about what is in the Kenyon bill than I do about the signs of the Mexican zodiac.

MR. KING. The gentlemen to whom I have referred are men who are engaged in the live-stock industry and have been, some of them, for 35 years. They know what the live-stock industry is and they know what the packers' industry is. They know what the so-called Kenyon, Kendrick, and Anderson bills are. They are opposed to them, and they are not influenced by any packers or by any representations made by the packers.

MR. THOMAS. Then they are an honorable exception to the rule.

MR. KING. I do not agree with the Senator at all.

MR. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope this practice will not continue, but I wish to say that the names mentioned by my colleague [Mr. KING] are among the very best citizens of my State. I do know that they are interested in the cattle and sheep business. This seems to be a propaganda between the packers and the National Wholesale Grocers' Association, one upon one side and the other upon the other. I think myself we have published in the RECORD about as many of such letters as ought to be published.

MR. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he claims that the National Wholesale Grocers' Association, as he calls it, is carrying on this kind of a propaganda. All I have seen that they have been doing is to try to thwart what the packers are doing.

MR. SMOOT. The Senator has not seen all that this organization has been doing.

MR. KENYON. No; I have not.

MR. SMOOT. This organization is generally very active in propaganda for any legislation that they desire, or are opposed to, the same as the packers are. They have injected themselves into legislation on other occasions by the most widespread propaganda. I think the Senator introduced in the RECORD yesterday a number of telegrams received by him from that organization in relation to the propaganda of the packers.

MR. KENYON. Yes.

MR. SMOOT. It is a fight of the National Wholesale Grocers' Association, and they are at present endeavoring to bring in the retail grocers' association against the packers of the United States. That is what the fight means.

MR. KENYON. I suppose the Senator from Utah stating that ends the controversy; but there is no such fight at all. The Wholesale Grocers' Association may be fighting for their lives against the packers. I expect they are; but that is not the fight. The fight is between the people who have to have things to eat and those who are controlling their food prices, whether it be the packers or the wholesale grocers' organization, or whatever it may be.

MR. SMOOT. I wish to say if the wholesale grocery companies made no more profit upon the overturn than the packers of the country do, and the retail grocery concerns of the country made ten times the profits the packers do in their overturn, the high cost of living would be greatly reduced in every part of the United States.

MR. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator from Iowa that the wholesale grocer is engaged in a holy crusade. He can commit no wrong. I know what the wholesale grocer has done in politics in the Mississippi Valley. When they start on a crusade or begin a propaganda they are just as persistent, just as solicitous of their own selfish interests, as any occupation I know of in this country.

I have some acquaintance with the wholesale grocers' associations and some of the retail grocers' associations in the various States. As the Senator from Utah has said, if they would confine themselves to the very small proportion of the profits realized by the packers, both large and small, the high cost of living in the country would be greatly reduced. But it is entirely sanctified when the wholesale grocers start a crusade. Anything they present is in deference to the holy right of petition secured by the Constitution and the blood of the fathers; but when it is presented by anybody else it is a vile propaganda, to be frowned upon and editorialized in the newspapers.

I should like to have the Senator from Iowa take some of his own medicine.

MR. KENYON. I realize that whenever any reference is made to the packers there are gentlemen who come immediately to their defense, and this talk as to a campaign by the wholesale grocers is, of course, a favorite weapon for them to use.

I have no defense of the wholesale grocers, or their overcharges, that the Senator has referred to. I realize, and everybody might as well realize, that those who always place a halo in this Chamber and other places around the packers are going

to make the reason why the bill now sought to regulate the packers should be defeated is that it is a fight between the wholesale grocers and the packers. If the wholesale grocers are doing this, let us get some way to remedy it. So far as the bills are concerned, introduced by the Senator from Wyoming and myself, the wholesale grocers of the country have had absolutely nothing to do with them, and you can not camouflage this issue to the country by putting up that kind of a smoke screen.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes, to make a statement with reference to this matter. I simply want to state that I have received, I think, several thousand telegrams and many hundreds of letters upon this question. I have not presented any of them to the Senate because they are coming to my office every day as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I also want to make it clear that, so far as I am concerned, I consider the bills introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the bills introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] upon this question are of the highest importance. I believe that the committee will sustain me in my position that hearings ought to be held on these bills, and that no drastic legislation should be enacted until the parties in interest have been heard.

These petitions come from business men and from farmers and, of course, from all parts of the United States. I believe they have a right to send these petitions to us. I do not wish to deny the right to anyone in our country to petition Congress.

It is possibly true that a propaganda is carried on and that some one is responsible for it, but I want to make it perfectly plain that neither the Government—and when I say the "Government" I mean the Federal Trade Commission—nor the packers will control the action of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry how to proceed. My course will be pursued in accordance with my own belief and understanding, and I shall direct my efforts to do what is for the best interest of the public.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was a member of the Federal Trade Commission when the Borland resolution was introduced to investigate the meat packers of the country. I personally know that one of the greatest lobbies that has ever been before Congress tried to defeat the Borland resolution. After the Borland resolution was passed and the Federal Trade Commission began investigating the packers, the packers had a great lobby here trying to prevent the investigation from being thorough in going into the high cost of living.

While a member of the Trade Commission we investigated the Standard Oil Co., and other great trusts, and I think if you will read the report of the Federal Trade Commission you will find that the packing interests of the country are equally as dangerous to the consuming public. They affect the cost of living of every man, woman, and child in the country.

I know that these people have influenced some of the very best men in my State and had them telegraph me here to oppose these measures which they would not have done had they understood the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] assumes to speak as a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, now a Senator of the United States, I think it no more than just to have placed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Swift concerning the report of the Federal Trade Commission of July 11, 1919, so that both sides of the question may be brought to the attention of those who may read the RECORD.

Mr. KENYON. What is the date?

Mr. SMOOT. July 11, 1919.

Mr. KENYON. If the report of the commission to the President has not been placed in the RECORD I am going to ask during the day that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether it has been printed in the RECORD or not. I will place the statement of Mr. Swift in the RECORD now, if there is no objection, and the Senator can place the report in the RECORD if he so desires.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. LOUIS F. SWIFT CONCERNING REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ISSUED JULY 11, 1919.

"CHICAGO, July 11.

"Louis F. Swift, president of Swift & Co., to-day declared that the latest report of the Federal Trade Commission contained no new facts and was an evident effort to influence at this time proposed radical legislation.

"Mr. Swift said:

"This latest report of the Federal Trade Commission is merely an attack upon large and successful business organiza-

tions, and should be resented by all Americans who are proud of the industrial progress of the Nation. It contains nothing new, and it is an outgrowth of the former discredited Heney ex parte investigation.

"This report, so far as I am informed, contains absolutely no evidence of collusion among the five largest packers; and I say for Swift & Co., as I have said many times, that we have no agreement of any kind with any other packer to affect the prices of live stock or meats.

"The manner in which the Trade Commission juggles figures and resorts to sensationalism betrays the insincerity of the commission. We are living up to both the spirit and the letter of the law and want to cooperate with the Government in every helpful and constructive way, but we must protest against the methods used by this important branch of the Government.

"I say that the large packers and their individual businesses are a public benefit and a decided factor in keeping down the spread between live stock and meat prices.

"This report is put out now as a part of the propaganda in which the Trade Commission, with others, is engaged, seeking to subject the packing industry and other lines of business to the arbitrary control of subordinate Government officials, through a license system.

"It is to be regretted that in these days, when the public feels keenly the pressure of high prices, a Government body does not give out facts respecting prices and profits. This has never been done fairly by the Federal Trade Commission as regards the packing industry, although the commission has constantly had the most complete information in its possession.

"No one disputes that out of the total receipts of the packers derived from the products of animals about 85 per cent is paid out for the live animals themselves. About 13 per cent is paid out for wages, transportation, and other such expenses. About 2 per cent on this turnover is earned by the packer as net profit. And no one disputes that this amount is but a small fraction of a cent per pound, and that it is so negligible as not in any event to affect the price which the consumer pays for meats.

"The report just issued by the Trade Commission and its discussion of the number of subsidiary companies and its calculation of percentages of the classes of business handled by the packers are not only erroneous, but are entirely immaterial to the real question in which the public is interested, namely, why are prices high?

"I do not believe that the findings of such a prejudiced and unfair report should be used to influence public opinion or as a basis for the radical legislation that has been introduced at Washington."

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	McKellar	Shields
Ball	Harding	McLean	Simmons
Bankhead	Harris	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harrison	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Henderson	Myers	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Nelson	Spencer
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	New	Sterling
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Swanson
Dial	Kellogg	Nugent	Thomas
Dillingham	Kenyon	Overman	Trammell
Edge	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Kirby	Poin Dexter	Warren
Fletcher	Knox	Pomerene	Williams
France	La Follette	Ransdell	Wolcott
Gay	Lenroot	Robinson	
Gerry	Lodge	Sheppard	
Gronna	McCumber	Sherman	

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are detained on official business.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in the course of some remarks by the distinguished and very learned Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] some time ago he made the statement that of course everybody agreed that peace was desirable and that war was undesirable, and certainly we all do agree to that; but it seems to me that there are other fundamental facts in connection with this most important matter that we can all agree upon. It seems to me that if no firm and binding agreement is made in this treaty to secure an enduring peace for the world in the future, then, of course, the world will lapse into that position where it was previously—namely, that the strong nations will continue to prey upon the weak; that the powerful nation will continue to take territory from its less powerful neighbor; that the great nations of the earth will continue to build up greater armies and greater navies at tremendous cost and expense, jeopardizing constantly the peace of the world; and that secret treaties will continue to be entered into, constantly menacing the peace of the world. It seems to me that any fair-minded honest man will agree that this will be true if no general agreement is had at this time to preserve the peace of the world. I believe even the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] will agree to these propositions. I believe they will also agree that if an agreement can be made making war impossible, or even greatly lessening the possibility of war, it would be the greatest one event that has happened in the history of the world for ages.

It is this step that the American Government under the leadership of Mr. Wilson has undertaken to take in this treaty before us to-day. If the effort is successful, it will mean more for the advancement, progress, peace, and prosperity of this country and all other countries than any one step that has ever been taken in our history, or, for that matter, that has ever been taken in the history of the world in 2,000 years.

Mr. President, there have been running through our entire history two lines of political thought. Most frequently those lines of thought have followed political lines, but not always. As we all know, they followed for the most part, first, Whig and Tory; later on, Federalist and Republican; later, Republican and Whig; and, later still, Democratic and Republican. I do not believe that any of these terms exactly express the idea that I wish to impress to-day. The true line of demarcation, as it seems to me, is better expressed in the more modern terms, "reactionaries" and "progressives."

There have ever been in this country from the beginning of our Government reactionaries who said that certain things could not be done; there have ever been progressives in our history who have said that things governmentally progressive could be done, and they have been done. It will be remembered that when our forefathers undertook to declare their independence from Great Britain there were Tories who said that it could not be done; and when it was undertaken later to establish a government, a republic, the reactionaries of that date said, just as they are saying now, "Oh, it can not be done; republics have always been failures. We ourselves have failed. The Continental Congress has been a failure; the Confederation has been a failure; and if you establish this Republic under the Constitution, it will be a failure."

That has been the cry of reactionaries throughout the entire history of this Republic. The line of thought has been defined perfectly in every age. It is defined to-day, Mr. President. When we come to consider this great contemplated step in our country's history, there are reactionaries who say that it can not be done, and there are other great progressive spirits who say that it can be done, and it is going to be done. There is not the slightest doubt that this league will be ratified, and this great forward-looking step taken by our Government and all the rest.

I wish to recall for a few moments to the minds of Senators here certain well-known facts in our history. You will recall that when our Government was first established we had only a little tier of territory along the Atlantic seaboard, running from Georgia on the south to Maine on the north, altogether not much larger than the State of Texas, if any larger. In every step of our growth since the reactionaries have interposed objections and endeavored to prevent the physical as well as the

governmental and moral growth and power of our country. Why, when Mr. Washington announced the doctrine of "no entangling alliances," he was denounced as a reactionary. No man who ever held the presidential chair was abused by so large a proportion of the people of this country as Mr. Washington was abused for the part that he took in the great progressive steps that attended the beginning of our Government. He became so unpopular that he was even called in derision the "stepfather of his country." Yet he took them, and we all realize now that under the conditions that then existed they were the very steps that should have been taken, and they made our country greater and stronger and better than ever before.

In 1803 Mr. Jefferson, the strictest constructionist of them all, the father of the Democratic Party, undertook to buy from Napoleon Bonaparte, who was then first consul of France and who was hard up for money, what is known as the Louisiana Purchase, a great empire in itself, stretching from the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. Immediately the reactionaries in this country, in the Senate and out of the Senate, took up the hue and cry against Mr. Jefferson. They said that he was doing an unconstitutional act in attempting to buy that great territory. They said that he was false to his own oath of office; they said he was untrue to his country; they said that as a matter of policy it was wrong, and no good could ever come of it. Yet we know that Mr. Jefferson pursued the even tenor of his way, notwithstanding his reactionary enemies, and made the purchase, which was duly ratified by the Senate; and who is there to-day who for a moment would think that Mr. Jefferson was wrong in the great progressive step that he took on that occasion? Yet he was abused just as much as the President of the United States to-day is being abused on account of the league of nations for taking that great progressive step.

A few years later, in 1817 and 1818, when Andrew Jackson had pressed the Indians and the Spaniards into the wilds of Florida and Alabama and Mississippi, and a treaty was proposed with Spain by which we obtained Florida and Alabama and Mississippi, and annexed that great territory to our country, the reactionaries in and out of the Senate condemned it as being unconstitutional and wrong, and yet it was done; and who is there to-day who will say it ought not to have been done?

Later on, in 1845, when a distinguished Tennessean was President of this Republic, when it was proposed to enter into a war with Mexico, when it was proposed to annex Texas, and when all that great territory of the West was taken in, Mr. Polk was abused and vilified just exactly in the same way that reactionaries have vilified and abused the President whenever a great step of this kind was taken.

In 1863—and I want to be fair about the matter—when Abraham Lincoln issued his proclamation freeing the slaves in this country, his act at that time was denounced as unconstitutional by men all over the land; and yet it was done, and who is there to-day that would say that it was wrong to have taken it?

When we bought Alaska in 1867, that was denounced as an unconstitutional and an injudicious act.

In 1898, and before that, when, under Mr. Cleveland and Mr. McKinley, Hawaii came in, that step was denounced in the same way.

In 1898, when Mr. McKinley was at the head of the Government, and the Philippines and Porto Rico were taken in, the distinguished colleague of the present senior Senator from Massachusetts on the floor of the Senate led the fight of the reactionaries, and abused the Government and the President of the Republic for leading this Government into taking the Philippines and Porto Rico.

So a few years later, when Mr. Roosevelt was President, in 1903, and Mr. Roosevelt overnight, as it were, entered into an agreement with the seceding State of Panama, and agreed to uphold the sovereignty of Panama as an independent nation in return for the right to dig the Panama Canal, we all know that the reactionaries in the Senate and out of it abused and maligned President Roosevelt, just as they are abusing and maligning President Wilson to-day for the great step that he wishes this country to take.

Think of those facts of history—great outstanding facts, each one of them, that we all now admit add to the greatness and the glory and the strength of this Nation, and yet every one of them was fought, fought to the bitter end in every instance, perhaps with the exception of Alaska—fought by the reactionaries!

What are the lessons to be learned from these well-known facts in our history—and I could refer to others—these facts that show that our country has grown from a little territory along the Atlantic seaboard into the greatest Nation in the world. Why, these facts show that this is no new proposition

that our reactionary friends are presenting to the Nation to-day. This is no new question. It is just the same old fight, renewed every time that a proposal is made to make our country richer and happier and more peaceful and more blessed than it was before. These are the lessons.

Senators, look to the pages of your country's history. What names do you find there? Do you find the names of the men who said that these great steps should be taken, or do you find the names of the reactionaries who said: "Oh, no; do not let us take them"? You find the names of Washington and of Jefferson and of Madison and of Hamilton, who fought to make this Government in its beginning. You find the names of Monroe, of Jackson, and of Polk, and of Lincoln, and of McKinley, and of Roosevelt, who have helped to build it up. But I should like to know if, with the exception of Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, any gentleman in this Senate, by drawing on all his learning and ability, can remember the names of those reactionary Senators who abused our former Presidents for taking these steps?

Oh, no, Senators. If you look to your country's history, you will find there emblazoned, in letters that will never be erased, the names of the men, the progressive men, who were willing to take these forward-looking and nation-building steps.

Mr. President, they were not backward-looking men. They were forward-looking men. They were not men who looked only to the past for precedents. They looked to the past for example, but forward to the future for action.

Mr. President, I next come to a statement that was made some time ago by one of my best friends in the Senate, a man whom I love very much personally, a great debater, one of the greatest in this or any other country, perhaps the greatest in the Senate or out of it. I refer to the advice given to us southern Senators in regard to voting for or being in favor of this peace treaty by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Well, I do not know; whenever a race question comes up I believe I will trust the southern Senators with being able to find out whether there is such a question arising. They usually know one when they see it. I doubt if we have to go elsewhere for advice on that subject. But the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri said to us that we were voting to put this Republic in the hands of the black and yellow and red races of the world, and principally in the hands of the black races, when we voted for this league. This is no new idea on the part of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri. I happened to look over some of the pages of our country's history in this connection, and I found a very strange statement that I wish to acquaint the Senate with for just a moment. I found, in going over the congressional debates of 1803, when it was a question of upholding President Jefferson in taking over the Louisiana Purchase, the same arguments made at that time by the reactionary Senators in this body that are being made now. I want to read from a current writing that was inserted in the RECORD at that time. Listen to this:

When we read the treaty—

That is, the treaty with Napoleon—

When we read the treaty we find that it involves our honor; it involves also our most essential interests. It takes out of the country almost a score of millions, enough to fit and equip such a fleet as would have rendered this treaty unnecessary. It changes the identity of our Nation. The United States are no longer the same.

Listen to this, now:

We are soon to look for our rulers to the red, yellow, and black brethren beyond the Mississippi.

The State of Missouri is a part of the Louisiana Purchase; and here, a little over 100 years ago, the argument was being made that if they took Missouri into the Union, or if it became American territory, we were going to turn our Republic over to the yellow, black, and red races across the Mississippi River, because at that time it was largely inhabited by those races.

Why, if you strike out "across the Mississippi River," that language is as much like the language of the senior Senator from Missouri on the league of nations as it is possible to make it; and I am curious to know if some ancestor of the senior Senator from Missouri did not write that speech.

But that is not all. The senior Senator from Missouri points to our turning our country over to the yellow and black and red races; and listen to what was said in the same debate:

The puny heads of our theorists—

He was talking about Jefferson then—

The puny heads of our theorists could not sustain so vast a machine as the government of the whole empire, supposing it should all be open to colonization and settlement.

He is talking about Mr. REED's State now:

And if they should adopt the more rational policy of keeping it an untrodden waste for owls to hoot and wolves to howl in, the realm of alligators and catamounts, they have not the vigor, and they dare not

use the means, to prevent the "squatting" of hosts of renegades and outlaws and fugitives who would laugh at our laws, and when they become numerous would defy our force and proclaim independence.

Why, it is almost parallel language to the speech of the senior Senator from Missouri on what is going to happen to us if we southern Senators permit this treaty to be ratified.

Ah, Mr. President, my gifted friend, my eloquent friend, my splendid friend, is wrong. He is wrong in his idea that because some of the black republics are made a part of this league it is going to hurt it. It is wrong in principle and can be proven to be wrong right here and now.

If the Senator from Missouri is right, the first thing that he ought to do is to prepare a law that will expel the States of South Carolina and Mississippi from this Union, because the States of South Carolina and Mississippi are black by an overwhelming majority. I think the States of South Carolina and Mississippi are very well represented in this body. I do not think the two Senators from each of those States should be expelled because a majority of their constituents are black.

It seems to me the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. HARRISON] and the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH and Mr. DIAL] have amply looked after the interests of those States with black majorities, and the country is none the worse off by the presence of those States or by the presence of such splendid representatives in this body. And yet if we follow the reasoning of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]—God save the mark—we can not keep these States in the Union. I think this argument is wholly unworthy of the great ability of the senior Senator from Missouri. It can not be accounted for except upon one ground, that he unwittingly permitted his prejudice against one man to interfere with his usual good judgment.

Mr. President, I next come to the proposition as stated by the distinguished and very learned senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Last December he made a speech on this peace treaty, but I am not going to read it; I am going to ask permission to put it in the RECORD. I am merely going to say this about it: In a part of that speech he made a statement as to what the United States should insist should go into the treaty. He virtually stated the terms that he thought should go into the peace treaty. A better statement could not be made by any man in America or outside. He stated as clearly and as accurately as any man could possibly state what should be included in the peace treaty.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 21, 1918, p. 725.]

Physical guaranties which when taken would make signatures to treaties negligible can alone assure a durable peace with Germany. I do not need to rehearse what those physical guaranties should be, for I have stated my views upon them more than once to the Senate, and I think there is a general agreement among them not only in the Senate, but among the American people. They include the restoration of Belgium, the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France, of the Italian Irredenta to Italy, the establishment of the Jugo-Slav State, and of an independent State formed by the Czecho-Slovaks. They include also the security of Greece, the settlement of Albania and Montenegro, the restoration of Roumania, the consolidation of all the Roumanian people under one government, as well as the neutralization of the straits, the putting of Constantinople under international protection, with Greece perhaps the mandatory of the powers to administer the affairs of the city, the independence of Armenia, the return of those portions of Asia Minor where Greeks are predominant to Greece, the protection of Syria and Palestine from the Turks, a large, powerful, and independent Polish State, the independence of Russia's Baltic Provinces, the return of Danish Slesvig to the Danes, and the neutralization of the Kiel Canal. These physical guaranties which I have thus far suggested all have one object, and that is so to hem Germany in that she can not attempt conquest in Russia or in the East, and that the Slavic populations, which she has mercilessly used in her wars, can never be used by her again. In addition to these guaranties there must be heavy indemnities paid by Germany for the ruin she has wrought in Belgium and northern France and in Italy, and for her destruction of vessels, both neutral and belligerent, through the use of submarines. In those indemnities the United States must have its proper and proportional share, not only direct indemnity for its ships destroyed by submarines and its people murdered on the *Lusitania* and other vessels, but a suitable restitution, in part, at least, of the vast expenses forced upon us by Germany.

It will be for the peace conference to determine what disposition should be made of the German colonies, but one thing is essential, and that is that they should not be returned to the tyrannical misgovernment of Germany, and that she should be deprived of those means for extending her commerce and building up military outposts in all parts of the world. The payment of the indemnities will be a work of time, and it will be necessary to take and hold ample security for the extinction of these debts. It is the duty of the Allies and the United States to meet and determine what terms they will impose upon Germany, and then, and not until then, call in the representatives of Germany and impose the terms upon them. When this is done the first great step will be taken toward the establishment of the world's peace. If we eliminate Germany from the opportunity to make war, the only source from which war is likely to come would be closed for generations. Such, in outline, are the necessary steps demanded by exact justice, upon which, I think, the United States and the Allies are substantially agreed, in order to make a lasting peace with Germany. By making peace by imposing the terms which we think proper upon Germany is only half the work which at this moment must be done. The peace must not only be made and agreed to, but it must be effective, and to render the peace effective there is much more to do than can be done by ink and paper. The first thing needful is to face the situation and look facts in the face. Nothing can be accomplished unless we work in complete harmony with those who

are associated with us in the war against the Central Powers. I know very well that technically we had no treaty of alliance with the Allies by whose side we fought, but technicalities are of no consequence in the presence of facts. No treaty of alliance could have caused a greater unity of action than was established between us and the nations with whom we joined in the war against Germany. Binding arrangements were made for common action in regard to food supplies, in regard to fuel, in regard to munitions of war, for the building of railroads and docks and everything concerning supplies of the armies in France. Our Navy worked in close alliance with the navies of Great Britain, France, and Italy. Our troops served under the command of a French marshal. All these things were vitally necessary, and these relations must be continued if we are not to lose at the peace table what we won in the field. To attempt in any way to separate us from our Allies now or to prevent perfect unity of action is as harmful as such efforts were when we were fighting in Northern France and on the plains of Flanders. To encourage or even to permit any serious differences to arise between the United States and Great Britain, or with France, or Italy, or Belgium, would be a world calamity of the worst kind. Any serious difference among English-speaking people would be deplorable in the highest degree. Any thought of war among them would be as abominable as it is inconceivable. To differ greatly with France, bound to us by so many ties of faith and affection, or with Italy, or with Belgium, is unthinkable.

Do not forget, however, that German propaganda with this object in view is as active and poisonous to-day as it has ever been.

We took up arms against Germany because we were determined not only to protect our own safety and independence against her attacks but because the people of the United States believed that if the world was to be a possible place for free, law-abiding people to live in, the autocratic system and the organized barbarism of Germany must once for all be eliminated from among the nations. We went to war to save civilization. For this mighty purpose we have sacrificed thousands of American lives and spent billions of American treasure. We can not, therefore, leave the work half done. We are as much bound, not merely by interest and every consideration for a safe future but by honor and self-respect, to see that the terms of peace are carried out, as we were to fulfill our great determination that the armies of Germany should be defeated in the field. We can not halt or turn back now. We must do our share to carry out the peace as we have done our share to win the war, of which the peace is an integral part. We must do our share in the occupation of German territory which will be held as security for the indemnities to be paid by Germany. We can not escape doing our part in aiding the peoples to whom we have helped to give freedom and independence in establishing themselves with ordered governments, for in no other way can we erect the barriers which are essential to prevent another outbreak by Germany upon the world. We can not leave the Jugo-Slavs, the Czecho-Slovaks, and the Poles, the Lithuanians, and the other states which we hope to see formed and marching upon the path of progress and development unaided and alone.

A little later the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] made another statement on another occasion in which he deprecated that differences had arisen between President Wilson and his colleagues on the peace commission and our Allies over there. Senators will remember that it was stated in the public prints that Mr. Wilson wanted to insert in the peace treaty the league of nations and that our Allies wanted to postpone it. Senators will remember that the reactionary Senators at once brought in resolutions to postpone the league of nations, and said that the President was not getting along very well with the other peace commissioners.

In that situation here is what the senior Senator from Massachusetts said. He wanted them to get along. I do not think he cared so much about the President of the United States, but he wanted to let it be known that the reactionary element of the Senate stood with these other gentlemen representing our Allies in opposing the President on the league of nations, and this is what the Senator gave out to the public at that time. It is impossible to improve upon the language. Here is what he said:

To attempt in any way to separate us from our Allies now or to prevent perfect unity of action is as harmful as such efforts were when we were fighting in northern France and on the plains of Flanders. To encourage or even to permit any serious differences to arise between the United States and Great Britain, or with France, or Italy, or Belgium, would be a world calamity of the worst kind. Any serious difference among English-speaking people would be deplorable in the highest degree. Any thought of war among them would be as abominable as it is inconceivable. To differ greatly with France, bound to us by so many ties of faith and affection, or with Italy or Belgium, is unthinkable.

Do not forget, however, that German propaganda with this object in view is as active and poisonous to-day as it has ever been. The people here and in the allied countries who would favor Germany are again busy in the effort to part the Allies and the United States from each other.

Mr. President, what has come over the Senator from Massachusetts and his associates? What has brought about the marvelous change in him? Mr. President, President Wilson and his associates at the peace council are absolutely at one with all of the representatives of the other great nations associated with us in this war. They have gotten along with the utmost friendliness in performing the great tasks that have been assigned to them. There is no substantial difference of opinion between all of the great allied nations. There is no substantial difference of opinion between the English-speaking peoples in that conference. The utmost harmony prevails. Apparently they are united in doing just what Senator Lodge said they ought to do.

The only discordant note, the only criticism, the only objection, the only fight, comes from Senator Lodge and his associates.

The only attempt to break up the cordial relations existing between the representatives of this Government and the representatives of the allied Governments comes from Senator Lodge and his associates in the Senate. No other nation, or faction, except possibly a faction in China, is making any trouble. No other nation is protesting. Our own people are not protesting. The only protest that comes comes from Senator Lodge and his associates.

Why this change? If it was a good thing, in the words of Senator Lodge, that the Allies and ourselves should work in perfect harmony, and that every action should be unified action last December, why is not it a good thing now? If it was a bad thing to encourage and permit serious differences last December, why is it a good thing for Senator Lodge and his associates to encourage differences now? If it was a bad thing last December for anyone to encourage serious differences among English-speaking peoples, why is it a good thing for Senator Lodge and his associates to encourage differences between English-speaking peoples now?

Senator Lodge even said that if any such differences were encouraged, it was due to the German propaganda. It can't be possible that this great change that has come over Senator Lodge and his associates is due to German propaganda. I know the Senator too well to believe that. We all know and believe in his patriotism and admire his Americanism.

Oh, Mr. President, it seems to me that Senator Lodge owes an explanation to the country as to why this great change has come about in the matter of encouraging differences. He should tell the country why it is that he is now trying to drive a wedge between the American Government and the American people and our allied Governments and our allied peoples, who are striving with one accord to obtain a peace treaty that will do just what Senator Lodge demanded should be done by a peace treaty.

We must remember we are still in a state of war with Germany. It is just as necessary to present a solid front to the enemy as ever.

Mr. President, in the beginning of my speech I said that all people approved Senator Lodge's statement that peace was desirable and that war was undesirable. An apparent exception to that rule is the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. Most of the Senators opposing the league of nations claim they want to bring about an enduring peace. Not so with Senator Knox.

He has announced a doctrine and offered a resolution on it that would most likely bring about perpetual war. His proposal is the only proposal that has been made in lieu of the league of nations. It is not a peace proposal at all. It is a war proposal. Of all the remarkable utterances ever made on the question of peace, probably the utterance of Senator Knox is quite the most remarkable.

His first modest proposal was made on December 18 last, and read, as follow. Listen to this:

Can we not perceive emerging from these facts—

The facts of this war—

a new American doctrine? I will state this great new doctrine in these words: If a situation should arise in which any power or combination of powers should directly or indirectly menace the freedom and peace of Europe, the United States would regard such situation with grave concern as a menace to its own freedom and peace, and would consult with other powers affected with a view to concerted action for the removal of such menace.

Again, on March 1 he said:

Meanwhile our cobelligerents need have no anxiety, for so surely as the sun rises, if the Hun flood again threatens to engulf the world, we shall again be found fighting with the same complete accord, with the cooperation as in the past, all for the defense of civilization.

A few days ago he followed it with a resolution, the last section of which reads as follows:

That, finally, it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, carry out the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization.

This is the plan proposed in lieu of the league of nations by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. What does that plan mean? Is there any attempt to settle wars in a peaceful way? Is there any attempt to arbitrate differences? Is there any attempt to adjust and compromise and settle international disturbances and disputes? None whatever. The doctrine announced by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania is just a rehash and a restatement of the Monroe doctrine, applying it to Europe. If it were carried out, if that announced doctrine were carried out, we would become simply the chief of police of

Europe, mind you, not with agreements that war should not be made, but with an agreement that Europe can stir up all the wars she wants and we will be the policeman and we will stop the wars. Why, if that solution of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania should become the law of the land it would take 5,000,000 American soldiers on guard in Europe all the time to preserve the peace; it would take the largest navy in the world, a larger navy than all the other navies in the world, to preserve the peace of Europe if that resolution should be passed.

No wonder that a reactionary committee, if I may call it that, unanimously turned down this resolution; if not unanimously, then very overwhelmingly. I do not recall. Of course, I am not a member of the committee. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] shakes his head. I imagine by that he means it was a majority, but it was, according to the papers, a very considerable majority that turned it down. No wonder they turned it down, because it would involve us in war. It provides no agreement to keep us out of war. Instead of being a peace treaty, it would be a war treaty, a treaty to incite, to produce, war throughout the world. The remarkable thing about it is that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, after introducing a resolution like that, is against extending the Monroe doctrine to the world. If we extend the Monroe doctrine to Europe, it seems to me, everybody would say that it might as well be extended to the world, as it is in this peace treaty.

Mr. KING. Will it interrupt the Senator if I offer a suggestion?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all; but I hope the Senator will be very brief, because I have in my mind a line of thought which I wish to carry out.

Mr. KING. I think the attitude of the Senator respecting the position of the eminent Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. The Senator might, with equal propriety, have continued and stated that such a policy as that suggested by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania would have prevented the protection of the new governments that will be established—the Polish Government, the Czecho-Slovak and Jugo-Slav nations—and the war would have to be fought over again, or some other war following quickly, unless those Governments are protected and placed upon their feet and put in such a position that they may continue as independent Governments in the family of States of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for his excellent contribution. I am coming to that in just a few moments. I am going to discuss that a little later in what I have to say.

I now come to the league itself, and I am going to be very brief about it, because it has been gone over by men who are better judges of it perhaps than I am.

The purposes of this league, as set forth in the preamble, are to bring about international cooperation, to bring about international peace, to bring about a better state of feeling, and of dealing one nation with the other to uphold international law and to uphold the inviolability of peace. That is not the wording of it, but that is the substance of it. I read its exact words:

To promote international cooperation and to secure international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war; by prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations; by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments; and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealing of organized peoples with one another.

I wish now to discuss for a moment the components of the league, about which much has been said. In the original number of States that belong to the league there are 32, while 13 others have been invited to come in, nations from all over the world.

The proposed league will include in the beginning 32 members—the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Serbia, Australia, New Zealand, India, China, Hedjaz, Siam, South Africa, and Liberia.

The States that have been invited to join the league are Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela, making 45 in all.

In the first members of the league America has 13 independent States as members, Europe has 10 independent States as members, Asia has 6, Africa 2, and Australia 1. When the 45 come in the division will be 19 American States, 16 European States, 7 Asiatic States, 2 African States, and 1 Australian State. What has America to be afraid of from that kind of a situation? We are on terms of very intimate friendship with all our South American and Central American neighbors. We have nothing to fear from them. Besides, every international league action must be unanimous, as I shall point out a little

more accurately in a few moments. Under these circumstances it seems to me that America certainly has not very much to be afraid of. Europe naturally might desire a plurality, but as it is America has the plurality.

The jurisdiction of the league is partly set forth in article 2 as follows:

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

In sections 3 and 4 the assembly and the council are given the power to "deal with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world." These two statements constitute the general scope of the league's jurisdiction.

However, the league is given jurisdiction over the following specific matters:

First. The effective settlement of international disputes which may lead to war, as I shall hereinafter more specifically point out.

Second. It is given, in article 17, jurisdiction over international disputes between a member of the league and a State which is not a member of the league, or between States not members of the league. The league is given jurisdiction to invite the settlement of disputes between such nations upon the same terms upon which members of the league might settle their international disputes. If these nations do not accept such invitation and do not arbitrate or adjust their differences as provided for in the constitution of the league, then the council is authorized to make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

Third. In article 10 the council is given jurisdiction to take such steps as will prevent external aggression upon the territorial integrity and political independence of all members of the league.

Fourth. It is given jurisdiction over those colonies and territories which, as a consequence of the late war, have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the Central Powers, which colonies are required to be governed by mandatories reporting to the league.

Fifth. It is given jurisdiction over secret treaties in that no treaty is to be held valid or binding until registered with the secretariat and thereafter duly published to the world.

These are the general powers given to the league. It has also some advisory powers, which are as follows:

First. The council is given the power to formulate plans for the reduction of armaments and for the control of the manufacture of munitions and implements of war. When the council has prepared these plans it submits them to the several Governments and when adopted by the several Governments it becomes operative.

Second. Under article 23 the league is given advisory powers over the following subjects:

- (a) Fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children everywhere.
- (b) Just treatment of native inhabitants under control of the league.
- (c) A supervision over traffic in women and children and traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs.
- (d) General supervision over trade in arms and munitions.
- (e) Freedom of communication and transit and equitable treatment of commerce everywhere.
- (f) Advisory powers over the prevention and control of disease.

In addition to the foregoing specific grant of powers the following statement is found in article 15:

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

It will thus be seen that the league of nations has no jurisdiction over any matter that is not international in its nature and over no matter that does not involve a dispute that might lead to war. It has no jurisdiction over any domestic matter or any matter which is declared to be domestic by international law.

Indeed, the peace conference put in the most admirable definition of the kind of disputes the league will settle, made by a distinguished ex-Senator, the Hon. Elihu Root, of New York. This is found in article 13 of the treaty:

Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration.

No internal policy of a nation is in any wise affected. There is no interference with nationalism. There is no interference with any internal affairs or concerns of any nation. The whole jurisdiction committed to the league of nations is over matters that are naturally the subject of treaty.

It is true that an advisory jurisdiction is given over questions of labor, questions of traffic in women and children, questions of public health and harmful drugs and the like, but this is specifically limited to an advisory jurisdiction and is subject to the treaties already entered into and which may be entered into in the future by the several nations composing the league.

That is the whole jurisdiction of this league, the actual and advisory jurisdiction. The actual jurisdiction is over international matters purely. This advisory jurisdiction is rested purely upon treaties between the nations already made and that will be made hereafter, and for that reason this jurisdiction can not hurt this country but will aid it in every way possible, will add to its trade and commerce, and spread its principles of freedom and good government.

We all know how the league acts if a controversy is brought to its attention, but I should have first described the council and the assembly.

The council is composed of nine members, five of them permanent and four of them temporary. The five permanent members are representatives of the United States, England, Italy, France, and Japan; the four others are selected by the assembly, but the first members were elected by the peace council. They are Brazil, Spain, Greece, and Belgium. This council has to act unanimously.

The assembly is composed of representatives of all the nations of the world who are members of the league or who may become members of the league. Each nation has one vote, but may have three representatives. There are a number of questions within the jurisdiction of the council, as I have said, in connection with which either of the parties may appeal to the assembly, and, usually by a majority vote, the assembly either confirms or does not confirm the action of the council.

When an international question comes up, what is the course of action? It may be settled in various ways under the terms of this league. It may be settled in the usual diplomatic way; and if it can be settled through the usual channels of diplomacy, it is done in that way and that ends it. If nations have treaties that provide for courts of arbitration or commissions of arbitration, the nations may submit the controversy to such courts or commissions, and the controversy may be settled by arbitration. If the controversy is not so settled, there is a court of international justice which is established by the league, and international difficulties may be settled in that way. If, however, all these measures fail, nations can carry the controversy to the council. When they carry it to the council, the council must take it up. Briefs may be filed; arguments may be made; the council hears the case and must decide it within a reasonable time—within six months—and no nation can make war until three months after the controversy shall have been decided.

Every fair-minded person must believe—and I do not see how any man can escape the conclusion—that that is a perfectly splendid plan to prevent war. If we had had that plan in 1914 there never would have been this great World War, in which ten millions of young men lost their lives and countless billions of property were destroyed. That is the plain, everyday, carefully worked out method by which these disputes may be settled.

How are the decisions to be enforced? The matter of enforcement is just as simple. As to any member of the league or non-member of the league, under the conditions which are stated in the league constitution, if a controversy is submitted to the league and unanimously decided by the council against a nation, then that nation, if it is dissatisfied with the decision, may appeal to the assembly. If a majority of the assembly uphold the council, the decision is final and binding, and all members of the league are required to uphold the decision of the council and of the assembly.

The decision is upheld in this way: Trade embargoes, commercial embargoes, and financial embargoes may be instituted against the nation that will not abide by the decree of the league. In my judgment, a trade embargo, a financial embargo, or a commercial embargo will be absolutely effective every time to effectuate the carrying out of the decree of the league, for no nation is going to undertake a trade war or a financial war against the entire world. If, however, that method of enforcement is not effective, then the league has the right to advise what military forces each nation shall produce to uphold the league's decree. Each nation is compelled to furnish such force, and when it is furnished that force is obliged

to settle the question. Our Nation, which is the greatest and the strongest and the richest Nation in the world, is not going to undertake to fight either in a trade war or a war of arms with all the world. It is perfectly idle to think that we would do it. We are not going to do it.

For that reason, when the league is established it is going to mean that in the future we are not going to have war. It is going to be effective. It is going to be just exactly like the Constitution of the United States. In 1787, when the Constitution of the United States was framed, men denounced it and said it would not work. They denounced it up to the very time that the number of States necessary to its ratification came into the Union, and in most of the States of the Union the vote as to whether or not the Constitution of the United States should be established was very close. Two, I believe, did not ratify it at all. That was largely because it was said by its opponents that the Constitution would not work. But it has worked, to the betterment of the world and to the peace and happiness and prosperity of the people of this country through all the years. If it is adopted, this league will do the same thing.

What are the objections which have been urged to the league? Our reactionary friends have raised a great many objections to it. Senators will remember that last November and December, before President Wilson left this country, after it was announced that he was going abroad as a member of the peace council, this happened: The reactionaries in the Senate and outside of the Senate, in the newspapers, in the magazines, everywhere they could get an audience, stated that President Wilson was going over there to the peace council for ulterior purposes; that he was going there to establish a superrepublic; that the republic that he expected to establish was going to be over and above all the nations of the world; that he was tired of presiding over a little country like the United States of America; that he wanted a world republic; that he wanted to be the president of it; that this world republic was going to have the power to tax; that it was going to have the only army in the world; and that it was going to have the only navy in the world. How idle were all these assertions—Senators will find the RECORD full of them—which were made by reactionary Senators last fall. Everywhere it was stated that the ulterior purpose of the President in going to Europe as a member of the peace council was that he could set up a world republic.

Was a single prediction fulfilled? Not one. When the draft of the league of nations came in and it was understood what it was, it was discovered that the league did not have any power to tax; it does not have any army; it does not have any navy; and a president is not even provided for, yet those were the criticisms made by the reactionaries who opposed this league before they knew what it was.

After they found out what it was, in a general way, what happened? It seemed to me, after the situation became known, after these objections were proven to be no longer well founded, that its opponents would have withdrawn their objections to the league, but they did not do so. They at once proceeded to urge many new objections to it. The principal objections, as I remember them, were these: That we did not have a right to withdraw under it; that the Monroe doctrine was not taken care of under it; that we would be compelled to be a mandatory, whether we wanted to or not; that we did not have a right to amend it; that the league's action would be by majority vote; that justiciable questions were not stated in it; that domestic questions were not excepted. There were also a number of other more or less important objections to it.

The peace council took up those objections and provided for every one of them. The right to amend was recognized; we have a right to withdraw from the league; the Monroe doctrine is specifically named; justiciable questions are set out; all votes except immaterial ones must be unanimous; no domestic questions can be considered by the league; we can not be required to be a mandatory; all those matters are specifically provided for. Surely, it looked as if there ought not to be any objection to the league after all these amendments to it were adopted, but our reactionary friends were not willing to stop the fight. Every conceivable objection to the league was presented. It is true, they all differed about it themselves, and Mr. Root was sent for to advise leaders. He came to Washington, and, to use a favorite expression of the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, he began to coordinate and function the objections to the league, as stated by the reactionaries in the Senate, and brought them all down to three. Here are those three, namely, the Monroe doctrine, the right to withdraw, and article 10. The objection as to domestic questions had already been met, so that the three I have named, in substance, are the objections that Mr. Root

has stated, and they are the only objections which an effort is going to be made to meet by way of reservations. I wish to discuss those objections for just a moment.

The ones I have named are the only real objections that are now urged. Many have been urged; many have been abandoned; several have been accepted, until now they have sifted down to three. One is as to the right of withdrawal as provided for in article 1; the other is the effect of article 10; and the last is in regard to the Monroe doctrine. I will proceed now to discuss the first objection, namely, that relating to withdrawal. The words, as I remember, are substantially, if not actually, as follows: "Any member of the league may withdraw upon giving two years' notice of its purpose so to do, provided that all of its international obligations and all of its obligations under this covenant are fulfilled at the time of withdrawal."

I heard the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] on the subject several days ago. As I recall his position, he stated that the right to withdraw was absolute, and that the withdrawing nation had the absolute right to determine whether or not its international obligations or its obligations under the covenant had been discharged. I am sorry that I can not agree with the Senator from Virginia on that subject. I do not think that is the real interpretation of that language. I believe that any member of the league has the right to withdraw—there is no question about that—upon giving notice; but as to whether it has performed all of its international obligations or its obligations under the league covenant manifestly the other parties to the contract have a right to say. My proposition is that it is perfectly right that they should have the power to say as to that. We can not be hurt by it. If this Government wishes to withdraw and has entered into an international obligation or an obligation under the league covenant, it ought to fulfill that obligation before it asks to withdraw, and the league naturally would have jurisdiction over that question. If some member of the league should raise the question as to whether the United States in a given case had performed its obligations under the covenant or under international law, there would have to be a unanimous opinion of the body, except for the representatives of the two nations interested in the controversy, and then either side can appeal to the assembly. Surely that is right and fair, and I do not object to that provision of the article. I think that it aids and helps the article.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. New in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I am glad to hear the Senator discuss that question, because to me it is one of the most troublesome in the covenant. As I understand, the Senator takes the position that we can not determine whether or not our obligations have been fulfilled; that that must be determined by the council or by the assembly?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so.

Mr. KENYON. I agree with the Senator. Say that we have served notice to go out, and when the two years have expired some other nation takes the position that there are international obligations unfulfilled on our part. We say there are not. There would be a dispute then that might lead to a rupture, and consequently that question must go either to arbitration or to the council.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the rules of the league.

Mr. KENYON. Yes. If we do not submit it to arbitration it goes to the council. I wish to ask the Senator this question: Suppose the council decides that we have not fulfilled our obligations and can not withdraw, what then? I have never heard any exposition of that. It seems to me that from there on the pathway is perfectly dark; there is no light shining on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope that I may give the Senator what I think of that, and I hope that my view will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. KENYON. Of course we could go out by force, but we would break a moral obligation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course. On that subject I will say to the Senator that if this Government enters into an international obligation or an obligation under the league covenant, it is its duty to keep it absolutely. I am not talking about the morality of it. I say it is an absolute agreement that ought to be kept, and if the representatives of seven nations that sit on the council unanimously decide that we have broken our covenant or our international agreement, we ought to fulfill it, just as we ought to fulfill any other obligation whether we want to do so or not. I believe in the validity of obligations between individuals, between organizations, and between Governments, and they ought to be fulfilled absolutely.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I think it must be true that the United States would not seek to go out unless it had fulfilled all its international obligations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is true.

Mr. KENYON. Suppose this country feels that way about it—and there may be a Congress elected on that issue—but other nations that may not have that high sense of honor that we believe the United States has say "You have not fulfilled these obligations," and we say "We have; we are going out," and we go out. Now, what then? Can anybody keep us in?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we can go out.

Mr. KENYON. Would that, then, be an act of war?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think not. I think it could only be an act of war when the unanimous opinion of the council held that we had not fulfilled our obligations. I believe that in any dispute that might arise surely we could trust the unanimous verdict of the representatives of the great nations that sit upon this council. If we can not, we ought not to deal with them at all.

Mr. KENYON. Should not they be willing to trust us also that we would not seek to go out unless we had fulfilled our obligations?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it takes away the strength of the clause, because exactly the same rule that would apply to the United States would apply to Great Britain if she violates it, or to France, or to Italy, or to any other member of the league. Every one of them have to be placed in exactly the same condition that the United States is in about it. I want to say that I for one as an American am perfectly willing to trust this council. We are trusting them in every other international matter. Why can we not trust them in this matter?

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator pursue just a little further the question that I asked before? Suppose they decide against us and we have a Congress elected on the issue of going out. We feel that our obligations are all fulfilled. We go out. Now, what then?

Mr. McKELLAR. Just exactly the same then that I expect to come to in a few moments.

Mr. KENYON. I will not ask the Senator to anticipate.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I will come to it right now. It is a good illustration.

The legislative and judicial departments of this Government are equal in power, and under our laws certain of our citizens under certain circumstances have the right to sue the United States before our Federal courts. Let us assume that the Senator is a citizen of the United States, and has a just claim against the Government, and sues the Government for a million dollars, and the courts give him a judgment for it, and the case is appealed to the Supreme Court, and a final judgment is entered in his behalf for a million dollars. Suppose it is a great domestic question that the Senator has raised by his suit, and an adverse Congress, unfavorable to the Senator's claim, has been elected. How is the Senator going to get his money under those circumstances? He can not get it. The Supreme Court has perfect authority to render a judgment against the United States, and whenever the Supreme Court renders a judgment against the United States it is a subsisting and valid obligation of this Government to pay, but it can not be paid until the Congress comes forward and appropriates the money directed to be paid. So the Senator would be in exactly the same position; and that constantly happens. It has occurred in the past that Congress has been exceedingly slow about paying some of these obligations, and it may be in the future that some such cases may arise; but I say to him that under our system of government it is the obligation of Congress to carry out the agreements that are made by the international branch of the Government, if I may so call it—the diplomatic branch of the Government. We constantly speak of our Government being divided into three great branches—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive. As a matter of fact, there are four—the legislative, the judicial, the executive, and the diplomatic; because, as we all know, when the President and the Senate, acting together, make a treaty, it is the supreme law of the land, just as much as any act of Congress, and can be set aside only by the President and the Senate, acting together in that regard, or by a repealing act of Congress.

Now, those things constantly happen. We can not predict them beforehand and say what Congress will do; but whenever a valid agreement is made by the United States Government—I do not care on what issues a Congress has been elected—I believe it will do its duty and perform the obligation that the treaty-making power put upon it when it made the contract.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. As I understand the Senator's position, then, if the council decided that we could not go out of the league, even if a Congress had been elected by the American people on the issue that we should go out of the league, we could not go?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I think the right to go out of the league is absolute; but the league can make us perform whatever obligations we have agreed to before we go out.

Mr. KENYON. How can it make us perform them? By war?

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is necessary, by war, or by furnishing the necessary troops.

Mr. KENYON. So that if we go out of the league, then, the Senator feels that all of the nations within the league are under some kind of an obligation to make war against us?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not necessarily at all. It depends entirely upon the facts of the given case. I will illustrate to the Senator again about that matter, because this goes to the constitutionality of this provision of the league.

Mr. KENYON. That is what is troubling me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps I can help the Senator out by another illustration.

The Senator recalls that in 1903, I believe it was, when Mr. Roosevelt was President, the State of Panama seceded from the United States of Colombia, I believe it is called, and, in the ordinary parlance of the papers, one night, or over night, the United States Government entered into a treaty with Panama by which the United States agreed to uphold the territorial integrity of Panama as an independent State, provided that Panama would permit, for a consideration, the building of the Panama Canal. That is familiar to us all. Now, mind you—and this comes more particularly in connection with article 10 than it does with this, but I am trying to answer the Senator's question and relieve him of that trouble if I can—the very statement of the obligation in that case guarantees the absolute independence of Panama. We all know that if it had not been for the statement of that obligation in that treaty, Colombia would have come in the next morning, perhaps, and recovered her lost province; but the very statement of the obligation that the United States would make war on any nation, Colombia or any other nation, that interfered with the sovereignty of Panama stopped any war by Colombia. That does not mean that Mr. Roosevelt and the United States Senate, acting together, as they had the unquestioned power to do, had done an unconstitutional act. That did not mean that the diplomatic branch of our Government, if I may so term it, had guaranteed or had made war in advance—not at all. The President and the Senate had simply agreed that if certain conditions existed the United States would make war.

Now, to answer the Senator's question, we have entered into this obligation, have we not? We have entered into this obligation to uphold Panama. By the way, the Senator will recall that it was a burning question before the American people for a while. You remember that it was attacked on the floor of the Senate as being an unconstitutional act of the President and the Senate, and that it was unconstitutional in that it took away the right of Congress to declare war, and said that this treaty had declared it beforehand. Now, suppose it became a burning issue, and a Congress was elected on that issue, and that issue was that if Panama got into trouble we would not make war. We have the obligation there to make war. If anybody makes war on Panama, we have to go to her assistance. In my humble judgment, whenever that obligation is presented to Congress, Congress is going to carry it out, it does not make any difference what issue was before the people when that Congress was elected.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not like to keep interrupting the Senator, and this is the last time I will do it; but if the Senator from Tennessee is correct, then the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is wrong.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so.

Mr. KENYON. That shows how great minds differ about the questions involved in this league of nations. Now, we less conspicuous Members have to look and do look to the leaders for wisdom. Here is the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who, in the absence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] at his summer home now and then, acts as the leader in this fight. He says here very frankly in a statement—and I have studied and meditated over that statement a good deal—that we can go out whenever we choose, after two years, of course; that it is up to this Nation to decide. Now, the Senator from Tennessee says otherwise. Would it not be well to have a question of that supreme importance, that is fraught with trouble

for the future, made clear, whichever way is right? If the Senator is right, let us write in that the league of nations is to determine the question of whether we have fulfilled our international obligations; but if the Senator from Virginia is right—and I want to believe he is right, but I fear he is not right—then let us write in that foreign nations shall have nothing to say about when we go out. That would simplify this debate and discussion a good deal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that if the Senator from Iowa and every other expert in this Senate should get together—

Mr. KENYON. I am not an expert.

Mr. McKELLAR. One moment.

Mr. KENYON. Well, I will not let that statement go unchallenged.

Mr. McKELLAR. I meant that in a proper sense. I think the Senator from Iowa is an expert on any matter that he undertakes to deal with or talk about. He is a man of unusual ability. I believe that if every one in this Senate agreed that this expression used in this part of the treaty was absolutely beyond cavil, the chances would be that in the future it would come up for construction. Every single provision of our Constitution, almost every word in our Constitution, every phrase in our Constitution, every sentence in our Constitution, has had to be construed in the 130 years that have passed since it was made. We can not say in advance what effect this provision or that provision is going to have. If it is wrong we can amend it, just like we have amended our own Constitution. We have amended it eighteen or nineteen times. There are more articles in the amendments to our Constitution than there are in the original Constitution itself. Amendments are provided for in this league of nations covenant. It would be easier to let us try it and work it out, and after we have it worked out, if it needs amending, then let us amend it, as provided in the Constitution.

Mr. President, that brings me to the next proposition, the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand the Senator's position to be that if he is correct and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is incorrect about that matter, then we could only be prevented from going out by the unanimous decision of the league that we had not fulfilled our engagements.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator, by the use of the words "unanimous decision," includes, I suppose, the representatives of the United States of America?

Mr. McKELLAR. The league covenant provides that if two members of the council are disputants, those two can not take part in the decision.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is with reference to a matter that is to be decided by arbitration or by submission to the council. In my judgment, that does not apply to this provision of the treaty. It applies only to those provisions where that is made an express condition. My own construction of that would be—and it is an offhand construction; I am not quite sure that I am correct about it—that the unanimous decision required in this case, to the effect that we had not complied with our international engagements, would include, of course, the vote of the member representing the United States. I want to ask the Senator if that is his view about that?

Mr. McKELLAR. The only way that question could arise is this, that some other member of the council or the league would say, "Here is an obligation that the United States has not fulfilled," and the United States would say, "Why, we have fulfilled it," and they would have to submit it to the council and to the league, just as any other question is submitted, in my judgment; and in that case the prosecuting member and the United States would not take part in the deliberations. But my position is that that is right; it ought to be that way.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that that is the Senator's position.

Mr. McKELLAR. It makes it stronger. I would rather have it that way than to have it so that any nation could withdraw at will, because if any nation can withdraw from this league at will upon giving two years' notice, we have not got any league.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not disagree with the Senator in those conclusions, but I think the Senator is wrong when he assumes that this would create a controversy such as is referred to in article 12 and the other articles requiring, where there is a dispute likely to lead to a rupture, that it shall be submitted to arbitration, and so forth.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be so.

Mr. SIMMONS. The reason why I think that grows out of the very language of those provisions. The language of those several provisions is about the same. Therefore I need only to read from article 12, which is the first article in which it occurs:

The members of the league agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture—

And so forth.

I wish to ask the Senator if those words, "if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture," do not refer to a dispute between different nationalities raising such a question as the league would have jurisdiction of with reference to international affairs? Is not that meant there, and not a controversy between a member and the league, as an entity?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am giving the views that I have with a great deal of diffidence, because I can not say that I am correct. The Senator may be entirely correct. I differ with him, and I am trying to be perfectly frank. I think it is a better provision just as it is. That is the only restriction that is in it now. If you can go in and make the obligation and then violate it at will, do you think that is right? I do not think any obligation ought to be violated in that way. I may be wrong about it. The Senator from North Carolina may be right in his view; the Senator from Virginia may be right in his view; but I think it weakens the strength of this agreement to take the view of either the Senator from North Carolina or the Senator from Virginia. I am satisfied with the language as it is. I am more satisfied with the restrictions that I believe are in it, because it treats all nations fairly and justly alike, and it gives us some common forum in which all international matters can be settled.

Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope Senators will not interrupt for just a few moments. I shall be very glad to go into this just a little later.

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a moment, if the Senator pleases. I think the question that has been raised is important from the standpoint of the view which the Senator has presented. I agree with him in the view he has presented, but the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has raised the question if a majority of the league should vote that we have not performed our international obligations and we should in defiance of that verdict withdraw anyhow, would it not create a cause of war? If the Senator from Tennessee is correct in his assumption that that would raise one of the questions agreed in article 12 to submit to arbitration, then he has admitted the contention of the Senator from Iowa that it would be a cause of war. I do not think it is a cause of war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Senators may differ about it, but I have that view and I want to submit it to the Senate for what it is worth.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think it refers only to disputes that arise between nations with reference to their relations to each other, not to disputes that arise between a member and the league itself.

Mr. KENYON. Suppose it were something that—

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator pardon me? If that contention be correct, then of course if the United States should withdraw without having fulfilled its obligations it would be guilty of a breach of good faith. I can not conceive that it would ever do that, but I do not think it would be a cause of war. That is the only question that I have raised, and I am not clear about it at all. It just occurred to me to raise it. I was really making the interruption for the purpose of getting advice and information from the Senator who is so ably addressing the Senate at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator's position is correct, then it would be impossible for us to get out of the league of nations. I wish to say in this connection that the position of the Senator from Tennessee, I believe, is exactly the same as the position of the President of the United States and absolutely contrary to the position taken by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I base that on the telegram which the President sent on May 10, 1919, to Secretary Tumulty for publication, which was published in all the papers of the United States. Among other things in that telegram appeared this language:

Happily, there is no mystery or privacy about what I have promised the Government here. I have promised to propose to the Senate a supplement in which we shall agree, subject to the approval of the council of the league of nations, to come immediately to the assistance of France in case of unprovoked attack by Germany, thus merely hastening the action to which we should be bound by the covenant of the league of nations.

That was the President's position.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now recall the telegram which the Senator has placed in the RECORD, and I am rather inclined to think that the telegram does uphold the position I take about the meaning of those words.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator permit me just one other word to clarify my position? I am not asserting the position I present as a mature judgment. My own judgment, however, is that that is not one of the questions which we have agreed to submit to arbitration, but if it is one of the questions we have agreed to submit to arbitration and there should be a disagreement about it, of course we would either have to let it go to arbitration or we would have to go to war.

I wish to say to the Senator, in addition, that I have not regarded this provision, even with his construction of it, as a provision of which the United States Government should complain. I think it is in our interest. We will never have a representative upon that board who will violate it; we will never seek ourselves to get out; and we do not want to get out unless we have performed our international obligations; but it is of great importance to the United States that every other civilized nation in the world a member of the league should be bound, before it can go out, to perform its international obligations. If it may result in a little inconvenience at some time to the United States, the resulting benefit in making it necessary for every other nation in the world that is a member of the league to comply with its conditions before it can get out is full compensation to the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the last statement of the Senator from North Carolina, that that will be its effect. That is directly in line with what I believe about it.

I next come to the question of the Monroe doctrine, which has been so often discussed. Article 21 of the league has this to say about the Monroe doctrine:

Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

How any reasonable mind after reading that language can come to the conclusion that the Monroe doctrine is not taken care of I can not understand. The Monroe doctrine is simply the expression of the President of the United States in 1823 that we would view with great concern the efforts of any European nation to implant its system upon any territory in this hemisphere. In other words, we simply guarantee by that doctrine the territorial integrity of every nation in this hemisphere. We have held on to that doctrine for nearly 100 years. It has done more to uphold the peace and preserve the territory and the liberty of the various nations of this hemisphere than any other doctrine that was ever announced. This league covenant in terms ratifies it. As a matter of fact, in the first draft the Monroe doctrine was not ratified in terms, though it was ratified in substance; but this later draft does ratify it. At all events, the league applies the Monroe doctrine to all the nations of the world, and it is fitting that that should be so applied.

Article 10, by which it is done and to which I now come, is the keystone of the arch. Without it this league would not have its proper force. Let me state why. We guarantee the territorial integrity of all the nations; and what does that mean? It removes the chief incentive to all war.

Mr. President, as I recall history, and I am speaking very generally now, every international war of any consequence that ever was fought was fought over territory, perhaps with the exception of the famous war between the Greeks and the Trojans, which, as we understand it, was fought over a red-headed woman, Helen of Troy. All other international wars have been fought about territory, and when you remove the power of a great nation to obtain the territory of a weaker nation, when you remove that principal reason for war, you preserve thereby the peace of the world. We have an illustration here now. How easy it would be for this country to overrun Mexico and take it but for the doctrine of Mr. Monroe and of the territorial integrity of the nations of the world.

This article is the keystone of the arch, and that brings me to an interpretation of the article, on which I differ with some other gentlemen. I call attention especially of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the observations I am about to make on this subject.

Article 10 is composed of two sentences, and I want to read them. They are very short. Article 10 of the league reads as follows:

The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league.

That is the first sentence, and here is the second:

In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

I suppose there is not a greater lawyer in this body, and probably not a greater lawyer in the whole country, than the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. His fame is nation-wide. His ability is known of all men as a great constitutional lawyer and any other kind of a lawyer. I approach the proposition of differing with him with the greatest diffidence. As I understood his position the other day, it was that when, in the second sentence of this clause, the council was given authority to advise what means were to be used to carry out or fulfill the obligations of this article, that it only gave a moral obligation to the council to advise; that the council had no authority to enforce the fulfillment of that provision.

I can not agree with that interpretation of these words. I think that interpretation of the words destroys in part the force and effect of the article. I believe that under those words, when the obligation has been created, if the territorial integrity of a nation has been threatened or interfered with, the council has the right to prevent that aggression in such a way as it may direct, and the word "advise" is used for this purpose. The council may say, of course, that the article has been violated, for instance, in the case of Mexico, and we announce that it has been violated. The council makes the statement that they believe all that it is necessary to do is to declare a trade war on the nation that has violated it. They advise that it is not necessary to use military force. Under those circumstances this Government is obligated to enter into a trade war against the nation that has violated the territorial integrity of Mexico. But it may be that the council, upon a careful examination, will find that armed naval forces should be used, and thereupon it would direct that the Governments of the world enforce that article by the use of armed naval forces, or it may be it would require armed land forces or naval forces and land forces; but whenever it advises what the requirement is, it is the duty of this Government to uphold and carry out the requirements of the league. To have any other construction destroys the force and strength of this article.

When we guarantee by treaty the territorial integrity of any nation and provide that armed and naval forces may be used, if necessary, to uphold the determination of the league, that is constitutional. Precisely the same provision is in the Panama Canal treaty with Panama. It is not a moral obligation; it is an absolute obligation; and the Congress, if it does its duty to the American people, must enforce it upon the advice of the league that armed and naval forces are necessary.

That brings me to the next proposition, that the league is neither unconstitutional nor un-American.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Before the Senator passes from the subject which he has just been considering, I inquire of him whether the last clause of article 10 would have any different significance if it read:

In case of any threat or danger of such aggression the council shall direct by what means this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Substantially it would be the same, but it would not as clearly express the intent of those who created the article—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. For the reason that there are several methods of enforcing this article placed before the league; that is, by financial embargo, by commercial embargo, by trade embargo, and then by armed naval forces or armed land forces. When the word "advise" is used, it is in my judgment used advisedly, because it at once becomes the duty of the council to determine what kind of force—whether financial force or trade force or commercial force or force of arms, either army or navy or air—shall be used for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of the league. Of course, the word "direct" would have in a sense the same effect, but the word "advise" more nearly expresses it.

Mr. President, the objections which have been raised to the league, in my judgment, are frivolous, with the exception of the one against article 10, but article 10 goes to the very life of the league. It is the great rock upon which the league is builded. It is the great power which will keep us out of war, which will preserve the peace of the world. Without it what would become of the nations that we have erected over in Europe? If we do away with article 10, the lust for territory will continue as heretofore, the great nations will oppress the weak, the strong nations will oppress and take territory from their neighbors from whom they think they can take it, just as of old. This

article gives great strength and power to the league, and, in my judgment, it is the strongest article in it for the prevention of future wars. We ought to agree to it just as it is, with all the power and authority therein contained. The interpretation given it by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and, as I understand, concurred in by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and other Senators, all great lawyers, would vastly weaken the power that ought to be had in the league to determine what kind of force shall be used in order to carry out the terms of this article, and with power in the league to direct the use of such means as it advises.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. KING. As I understand the Senator's contention, it is that the article which he is now discussing not only imposes a moral obligation upon every member of the league to adhere to and observe the advice of the council, but also a legal obligation, a legal obligation so strong and imperative in command as to be a compulsion. I did not hear all the Senator's argument.

Mr. McKELLAR. I tried to discuss that in connection with another matter. I doubt if the Senator's distinction between moral obligation and legal obligation is entirely correct. I tried to figure it out on that basis myself and came to the conclusion that it was not sound. For instance, if the Supreme Court of the United States renders a judgment in favor of a citizen for \$1,000,000, the Supreme Court has no power to carry it out. The Supreme Court can not furnish the money, the Supreme Court can not appropriate money to pay the citizen, but it makes what? A moral obligation, if you please; a legal obligation, if you please; a governmental obligation, if you please; but whatever it may be called, it is a binding obligation, and Congress is in duty bound to appropriate the money to pay the obligation. So it is with the obligation of article 10. This branch of the Government, the President and the Senate, could not together enforce this league; it is the bounden duty of Congress to carry it out. Whether you call it moral obligation, a legal obligation, or a governmental obligation, or whatever kind of obligation you call it, it is the duty of Congress, of the succeeding Congress or the existing Congress, to carry out that obligation to the very letter, whether it is a declaration of war, a trade embargo, or whatever it is.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator's position, then, would lead, as I apprehend him, this far, that all future Congresses would be compelled whenever the council rendered advice to declare war, if that advice called for the exercise of military or naval force, and therefore it would abrogate that provision of the Constitution which says that Congress shall have the power to declare war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. The Senator is totally wrong and wholly misconceives my argument. There is nothing unconstitutional about it. The provision, for instance, in the Panama treaty obligates the United States to make war on any nation in the world that makes war on Panama. As we all know, it obligates this Congress or any other Congress to make war against the war-waging enemies of Panama, if there are such. But it is not unconstitutional. Why? Because it is the act of a coordinate branch of the Government, and each Congress passes upon it. All I can say to the Senator is that whenever that obligation is presented to Congress, my faith in the American people, in their uprightness, in their integrity, in their honesty, is such that I believe they will inviolately carry out the obligations of this Government.

Mr. President, having these views, I regard amendments by way of reservations, with the exception of article 10, as frivolous. They mean nothing. The question of article 10 is material, but I think article 10 should be left just exactly as it is. It is the most important article in the treaty for the preservation of peace. I would not want to vote for a league that did not provide for guaranteeing the territorial integrity of every nation. I would not want to vote for a league that did not provide for effectually carrying this provision out. We ought to carry it out in good faith and in honor, and we will do so.

Now for a moment I am going to discuss proposed amendments. I am against any amendment, and I will tell you why I am against any amendment to this league. Of course, every lawyer knows that one of the parties to a contract can not change its terms and preserve the contract. This league has been entered into by all the nations of the world, and whenever we put an amendment in it it destroys the agreement and it has to go back to all the nations that signed it, and unless all sign again there is no agreement. I do not think we ought to

do that. If a reservation is put there, if it means anything at all, it means precisely the same thing. Any reservation that has any substance to it will have to go back to the signatory powers and be signed all over again. I am not willing to do that. This league has been made as the result of compromise, of concessions. The great powers of the world—those that saved the world and its civilization in the late war—gathered together in Paris with their best representatives and prepared this league. They yielded and conceded to each other. They have brought forth an admirable instrument. It has been not only signed but it has been approved by every civilized nation whose representatives have signed it, and all the peoples of the world are going to indorse it except two factions, and I am not sure that there will be two. The only two factions in all the world to-day that are against this league are a faction in China and a faction in the United States Senate of America. Those are the only two making a combined effort to defeat it. Is it possible that we are going to line up with a faction in China against all the rest of the civilized world? I do not think so.

The only method by which we can secure the world against such an awful sacrifice as has been made in the last five years, as we all know, is the present treaty. It is our duty to ratify it, to uphold it, to stand by it, and defend it.

Now, I want to give the reasons by which I am influenced. There are three incontestable reasons, Mr. President, why this league ought to be established and ought to be ratified by the Senate at the earliest moment possible.

The first of the reasons I am going to state is a financial one. That appeals to most men; I can not say that it ever appealed much to me; but that reason surely should have some weight, and I believe it will. What has been the cost in dollars and cents of the five years of war in which the world has been indulging? It is estimated that there are \$800,000,000,000 of wealth in all the world—carry those figures in your mind—\$800,000,000,000 of wealth of every kind, nature, and description in all the world. How much of it has been destroyed in the last five years of war which we have had? Two hundred billion dollars of wealth has been destroyed in the last five years; one-fourth of all the wealth in the world has been swept away by the war; and yet reactionaries in the Senate, backward-looking men in the Senate, contend here day after day that we should take no step to avert such an awful sacrifice of property in the future.

A gentleman from Memphis, where I live, Mr. Dorsey H. White, made this illustration to me the other day of the cost of the war to America alone. He is a man of wealth; he has one child, that child being about grown. He said that he had figured out that one-eighth of all his income had been mortgaged to pay the expenses of this war in America in the last two years; that one-eighth of all of his income had been mortgaged for the life of himself and of his child, and if that child lived to be three-score and ten years of age, and then 25 years longer, he estimated it would take one-eighth of his income to pay his proportion of the expenses of the war for the last two years. It also means one-eighth of the income of every man, woman, and child in this country who has an income and pays an income tax will be required to pay the cost of this war. Yet there are Senators here who want to go right along and let nations have all the wars they desire. If this war has taken off an eighth, and we have a war five or six years hence which will take off another eighth, and a war 10 or 12 years hence which will take off a quarter, the first thing we know the American people will not have any income. Therefore I say if we look solely to what it has cost the nations of the world we ought to enter into this league to prevent a repetition of war. If the league does not guarantee that, we ought to do the best we can to help guarantee the world against future wars of this kind.

It has been estimated that this war, without regard to indemnities, has cost Germany thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars; it has cost Great Britain \$36,000,000,000; it has cost France in the neighborhood of \$30,000,000,000; it has cost the United States in the neighborhood of \$30,000,000,000; it has cost Turkey \$23,000,000,000; it has cost Italy \$10,000,000,000; it has cost Russia \$20,000,000,000; it has cost Austria \$20,000,000,000; \$200,000,000,000 have been swept away; and yet reactionary Senators quibble over what the meaning of words is. Let us quit quibbling; let us do something for the good of humanity; let us stand by the prosperity of the world, and especially of our own people. Let us protect the boys of our great land.

Senators talk about what effect this treaty is going to have in China. Why, Mr. President, in all frankness, I have nothing but the kindest feelings for China, kinder, perhaps, than I have for Japan; but as for me, I think more of the lives of any one of the 60,000 American boys who lie sleeping in Europe forever and of their eternal sacrifice than I do of all the people of China. Let us look at it from an American standpoint, for the defense of American property and of American sons.

That brings me to the second incontestable reason. Mr. President, ten millions of young men have offered up their lives as a sacrifice to the awful monster of war in the last five years; ten millions of young men as full of life and enthusiasm as are any other young men have been cut off before their time, mown down by the ambition of a man like the Kaiser, who was willing to bring about this awful sacrifice of human life in order to get the territory of his neighbors which he desired. When you think of the sacrifice of those ten millions of lives of young men—60,000 of them American boys—do you wonder that I am willing to favor this league, whether it exactly suits China or not? I am not concerned so much about other nations, but I am concerned about the men and women of this country. The 60,000 families of the young men in this country mourning for their sons who have gone forever, the ten millions of families of the young men throughout all the world, are to be considered in this affair. We are here quibbling, we are here disputing, about the effect of a clause of this section and of that section, when we can not say what effect it is going to have or how it is going to be construed in the future, whatever we may say about it. We are, however, here quibbling about it. Do you think that the fathers and the mothers of these 60,000 young men think that way about it? Do you not think that they believe we ought to insert into this league some binding agreement which will prevent war in the future? They want wars stopped. They did not rear their boys to become gun fodder. That is why I am in favor of article 10, because when article 10 is adopted and is established firmly, with the power to carry it out, I do not believe any human monster like Wilhelm of Germany will ever plunge the world into war to gain more territory. The only purpose and object he had was to secure Alsace and Lorraine, or perhaps all of France and Belgium. When you take away from the rulers of the nations the right to make war in order to get territory, you will have done away with war in the world. It is for that reason that I believe that this league should be ratified and adopted without amendment and without reservation.

Now I come to the third reason. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] last December, when he stated the objects of the peace council, stated that he believed that a new State should be created in Austria to be known as Czechoslovakia; that Poland should be newly created out of a part of Austria and a part of Germany and a part of Russia; that Alsace-Lorraine should be reestablished as a part of France. The peace council have done those things. They have restored a part of Austria to Italy; they have reestablished Poland; and they have taken away Turkish territory and made a new State. Are we reasonable men? Are we thinking about what we are doing at all? Is it possible, is it conceivable, that any fair-minded men on earth would be willing solemnly to come together or to have their nations come together in a council and solemnly rearrange the map and arrange a new Czechoslovakia and a new Poland and yet provide no power to protect those newly created countries in the future? No more awful crime could be committed against the inhabitants of a new Poland or of a new Czechoslovakia or of a new Hedjaz or against the people of Alsace-Lorraine than to mark out their territory, as it is proposed by this treaty to mark it out, and then to turn them over to the tender mercies of ambitious neighboring rulers who want to invade their territory. If we do not enter into this league, and if we do not adopt article 10 of this league, it will not be three months before Poland will be invaded. The only way to safeguard and uphold the new States we have created is to have an agreement among all the nations to protect them.

Mr. President, for these three incontestable reasons I am in favor of this league without reservation and without amendment, for I believe the sooner it is ratified the better.

I next come to a question that I want to discuss very briefly. The newspapers have discussed at considerable extent the question that those who favor our entering this league are not simon-pure, 100 per cent Americans. I do not know how they obtained that idea. No American sovereignty will be violated by becoming a member of this league. It is purely a treaty, just as any other treaty made for the peace of the world or a part of it; and the United States has been making this kind of

peace treaties ever since we began as a nation. How there can be involved a contention against the pure Americanism of such action I can not imagine.

I wish to say that if there is a question of Americanism I am willing to submit the Americanism of the present administration and to compare it with the Americanism of any other administration that ever existed in this country. I desire to call attention to what has been done on behalf of America in the last six years.

Mr. President, in the last six years we have won one of the greatest wars that was ever fought among men. That is some accomplishment. Whether reactionaries or progressives, whether Democrats or Republicans, we all take pride in that Americanism; that our boys have won for us the greatest military victory of all the ages.

Less than six years ago the present administration instituted the greatest financial and banking system that has ever been known; a financial system that has made this country free; a financial system under which we have not only been able to finance ourselves but have been able to finance the world in the last five years of this war. Is not that Americanism? In the last five years under this banking system the United States from being the greatest debtor Nation in the world has become the greatest creditor Nation in the world. All men, I think, will agree that that is a great accomplishment.

What has been the next accomplishment? In the last six years we have restored to the seas the American flag which had been absent from them for 50 years. We have the second largest merchant marine in the world to-day. Flags on American ships fly in every port, on every sea; that is a great accomplishment. It seems to me that all fair-minded men will approve the Americanism which has thus been shown in building up our country. More than that, Mr. President, we have not only established the greatest financial system and built up the greatest merchant marine, but the United States has produced more and has had a greater commerce in the last six years than ever before in its history.

More than that, the American people have never been one-half as prosperous as they have been in the last six years. They have enjoyed a prosperity such as not only our Nation has never known before, but there never was such prosperity in any nation under the shining sun. Yet they accuse us of not being 100 per cent American.

Not only that, but while other Governments are trembling in the balance, the American Government to-day is stronger, better, firmer, and more stable than it ever was before in its history. More than that, there never was a day in our history when America was more respected abroad and more honored at home than the America of to-day. Yet they say we are not 100 per cent simon-pure Americans. We have done nothing except to help build up.

Oh, Senators, you can not vote against the proposed league covenant on any such excuse as that it is not American. It is one of the great steps, the last and the greatest of them all, in building up the greatest Nation in the world. Our days of isolation have gone; we can not isolate ourselves from the world any more; we do not want to isolate ourselves from the world any more. Our Nation is at the very forefront of all the nations. We must keep the lead that we have won.

There is then but one last objection—and, by the way, that is the only objection with the exception of the objections voiced by the four Senators whom I named awhile ago, Senators BORAH, BRANDEGEE, POINDEXTER, and REED, who have been against this treaty all the time—and I am going to tell the truth about it right now. I say to you that that objection is the hatred you reactionary Senators have in your hearts for Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States. Those of you who are opposing it, those of you who are asking for reservations, those of you who are asking for amendments, search down into the bottom of your hearts, look into them fairly and squarely, and you will find that it is your opposition to the President of the United States that causes you not to be for it. Nine-tenths of you were loud in your demands for a league of nations until you found that Wilson was really going to secure one, and to-day in your home States you contend you are in favor of a league, and you just want to amend this.

The President of the United States has taken the leading part in creating it; he has been at the forefront of the fight; he has done his full duty; he has brought about the best instrument possible; he is the leading figure in the world to-day, and some men are jealous of him, and they do not want to uphold him or to ratify this league because he made it. I say to you that, in my judgment, the President of the United States has his faults, as all men have, but he has done a wonderful work for this country. Under his administration this country has prospered as it never

prospered before; it is more honored abroad—I do not care what some may say about it—and more respected and prosperous at home than it ever was in any 25 years together of its history in the past. There is prejudice against him, yes; but his work has been a wonderful work, and it seems to me that any American citizen with the red blood of this country running in his veins must know that the President has been actuated by no selfish purpose, but has been looking alone to the good of his country and to the good of humanity and to the effective securing of the peace of the world. He has worked it out. It is the result of compromise. It ought not to be amended, and there ought not to be any reservations made to it.

Reactionary Republicans or reactionary Democrats who are opposing this league, let me appeal to you—do not let your hatred of any one man warp and set aside your judgment on this most far-reaching agreement of all the ages.

Under Mr. Wilson's administration we have progressed as never before in our history; we have prospered as never before in our history. We have become a world power faster than in any other like period in our history. He has led in every progressive undertaking; he has led in the recommendation of more remedial and progressive laws than have ever been enacted by the Congress in the same period of time in our history. He has upheld our institutions at home and upheld our honor abroad, and to-day the name of America is respected, admired, and esteemed by liberty-loving men and women and by fair-minded men and women all over the world. All of his work has been for America; all of his work has been practical as well as ideal, and the crowning work of his career is this peace treaty, which, in my humble judgment, should be unanimously approved by this body. Let not America, which has given this great peace covenant to the world, be the only one to repudiate it.

I thank the Senate.

PROPAGANDA ON PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I would not feel justified in taking the time of the Senate were it not that the country ought to know, if it is possible to get anything into the newspapers now concerning the packers, as to the propaganda they have instituted against certain bills now pending in Congress. I am not going to speak upon the league of nations, but I am going to speak upon this subject.

I believe the people of the United States are as interested in the question of the high cost of living as they are in the question of the league of nations, and possibly more so. I believe they are looking to the American Congress to take some action on that question. Senators are troubled as to what they can do, and so are Members of the House of Representatives. It is not an easy question. I have very serious doubt about our being able to do much, if anything. The only propositions within my knowledge pending in the American Congress looking to some action along this line are two bills, one introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] and one by myself. I regret that the Senator from Wyoming is not present.

A feeling of unrest among the American people due to the high cost of living is, or ought to be, a matter of concern to Congress. It is quite apparent that the pathway of the two bills referred to will have a few rocks in it and a good many thorns along the edges. If you ever wish to mass mighty forces in this country, just undertake to introduce bills of the character of those I have in mind. Those bills have not as yet been considered by the committee and will not be considered by the committee for at least a month; but I have telegrams here finding fault with Congress for permitting such bills even to be introduced.

A propaganda has been started, as I have heretofore stated on this floor, the like of which has never been seen in this country. The same situation arises as when Congress undertook to act on the railroad question. At that time men stood back and said: "Congress can not interfere with private business; that is our concern"; but that battle was fought out at that time. The telegrams and letters now coming in indicate that the packers and those whom they can control are in the same condition of mind, for they have become as powerful in this country as the railroads were at the time the fight to control the railroads was inaugurated. I know that in those days anybody who said the railroads ought to be controlled was called a "railroad baiter," and now the men who feel that the packers have reached a position in this country where they absolutely menace independent business are called "packer baiters"; they are met with sneers and slurs, while the cajolery and flattery of the sycophants of the big business interests of this country surround other men and lead them to believe that we had better be very careful in what we do with the big interests of this country, and the statement is made that we are

undertaking to war on great business. Not at all. Nobody wants to hurt legitimate business in this country.

Many of the telegrams and letters that come to me state: "We have had enough of Government ownership of business in the case of the railroads." That is one of the issues that is raised. The bills to which I have referred, however, are not bills for Government ownership of the packers; they are bills for Government control and regulation. No business yet has gotten so powerful in this country that it can stand up and say to the people: "How we conduct our business is none of your affair." When any concerns in this country have become so powerful that they are going into lines of unrelated business and practically controlling everything the people have to buy to live, they can not stand up and say: "It is none of your affair how we run our business."

What was the reason for the introduction of these bills? The Federal Trade Commission, a somewhat unpopular institution in certain quarters in this Chamber, so unpopular that a fight had to be made to preserve its appropriation, made an investigation of the packers. I do not know whether that investigation was made at the request of the President, although I am inclined to think it was, but, in any event, they made the investigation. They submitted two reports; one is of recent date, being of July 3, 1918. I am going to put this report into the Record. The Senator from Utah has placed in the Record to-day the answer of Mr. Swift, one of the packers, to this report. In their letter to the President some of the things set forth and some of the reasons given for proper governmental control are these:

It appears that five great packing concerns of the country—Swift, Armour, Morris, Cudahy, and Wilson—have attained such a dominant position that they control at will the market in which they buy their supplies, the market in which they sell their products, and hold the fortunes of their competitors in their hands.

Not only is the business of gathering, preparing, and selling meat products in their control, but an almost countless number of by-product industries are similarly dominated; and, not content with reaching out for mastery as to commodities which substitute for meat and its by-products, they have invaded allied industries and even unrelated ones.

Again further in that report they say:

The producer of live stock is at the mercy of these five companies, because they control the market and the marketing facilities, and to some extent the rolling stock which transports the product to market.

The competitors of these five concerns are at their mercy because of the control of the market places, storage facilities, and the refrigerator cars for distribution.

The consumer of meat products is at the mercy of these five because both producer and competitor are helpless to bring relief.

That is what the commission said to the President of the United States after months of investigation; but the only way this is ever met on the floor or anywhere else is to try to discredit the membership and the personnel of the Federal Trade Commission. The American people, however, have as much confidence in the Federal Trade Commission as they have in the Senate of the United States, and the effort to discredit them will not succeed.

Again they say:

Out of the mass of information in our hands one fact stands out with all possible emphasis. The small dominant group of American meat packers are now international in their activities, while remaining American in identity. Blame which now attaches to them for their practices abroad as well as at home inevitably will attach to our country if the practices continue. The purely domestic problems in their increasing magnitude, their monopolization of markets, their manipulations and control, grave as those problems are, are not more serious than those presented by the added aspect of international activity. This urgently argues for a solution which will increase and not diminish the high regard in which this people is held in international comity.

Again:

The commission, through Mr. Heney, had to meet deliberate falsification of returns properly required under legal authority; we had to meet schools for witnesses where employees were coached in anticipation of their being called to testify in an investigation ordered by you and by the Congress of the United States.

So the investigation was ordered by the President.

We had to meet a situation created by the destruction of letters and documents vital to this investigation; we had to meet a conspiracy in the preparation of answers to the lawful inquiries of the commission.

In the report to which I have referred, of which the letter to the President is a part, they point out that the five great packers jointly or separately wield controlling interest in 574 companies, minority interest in 95 others, and undetermined interest in 93, a total of 762 companies, and that they produce or deal in some 775 commodities, largely food products.

In addition to meat foods, they produce or deal in such diverse commodities as fresh tomatoes and banjo strings, leather and cottonseed oil, breakfast foods, vin fizz—

Whatever that is—

curled hair, pepsin, and washing powders. Their branch houses are not only stations for the distribution of meat and poultry, but take on the character of wholesale grocery stores, dealers in various kinds of produce, and jobbers to special lines of trade.

Again, as to financial power, the report in part says:

The packer has drawn to a marked degree upon the banks of the country for liquid funds. * * * he could not operate on the scale he does without the very large loans furnished by the banks. To assure himself loans ample to his purpose, the big packer has secured affiliation through stock ownership, representation on directorates, and in other ways with numerous banks and trust companies. Mr. Armour, Mr. Swift, Mr. Morris, and Mr. Wilson are directors in banks affiliated closely with those who are strong at the sources of credit in the United States. Being thus allied with the powerful interests at the sources of credit, the packers' power is great, not only for financing their own national and international operations, but for affecting, for good or for ill, the credit of cattle producers and of competitors or customers in any line.

Again, and I am still reading from the same document:

The reason why the packers are seeking control of the substitutes for meat—the foods that compete with meats—are obvious. If the prices of substitutes for meats are once brought under packer control, the consumer will have little to gain in turning to them for relief from excessive meat prices.

Again:

Judged conservatively by trade estimates, the Big Five handle at least half of the poultry, eggs, and cheese in the main channels of interstate commerce. Most estimates place the total production in dressed poultry and eggs controlled by the packers at a higher percentage.

And so it goes. They are in canned fruits, vegetables, groceries, wool, rice, banks, peddler car routes, refrigerator transportation, control of stockyards; and so they have grown on, as this report shows, into an institution of tremendous and far-reaching power.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in considering the Kendrick bill at the last session, had very illuminating hearings. I suppose few Senators have ever read them; but these facts being apparent to certain men, not wholesale grocers—for I never talked to one of them in my life about this bill, and I am sure the Senator from Wyoming did not—we introduced these bills to meet, as we thought they would meet, the situations that are presented in these documents that I have read and in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—more in the hearings than in these documents.

Now, what happened? Those bills were introduced on the 23d day of June. I am not going to enter into any minute discussion of the bills. There are perfectly legitimate objections to those bills, of course, in the minds of men who have no connection with the packers. Men who believe that the Government has nothing to do with private business, of course, object to them; men who honestly may object to the license system—and if they have any better method of handling the matter, let them bring it forward. So I have not any quarrel with those who are objecting to the methods of these bills and I have no quarrel with those who wire Members of Congress or work up propaganda to send in here to Members of Congress; but it is fair and right that Congress should know that what they are getting is so worked up.

Now, immediately they commenced to reach out to these various lines of industry, where they are powerful, the Thomas E. Wilson Co., on July 14, sent out a circular letter to their stockholders. I will place this in the Record. I do not want to encumber the Record with a mass of things, but I will try to pick out a few and put them in. They inclose a synopsis of this bill, and they wind up by saying:

As an investor, we believe you are interested in this proposed legislation, and it would seem to us that it might be helpful to your Senator and Congressman to have the benefit of your views upon this important subject.

That goes to the stockholders of Wilson & Co. on July 14. Bear in mind the date.

Swift & Co., on July 12, sent out a similar notice to their shareholders—I am not objecting to this, but we ought to know it—in which they urge them to write to their individual Congressmen and Senators and urge them to make a complete and thorough investigation before legislating upon this subject, and urge them to oppose the pending ill-advised and destructive legislation. That goes to all the Swift stockholders, 25,000 of them in the country. They also write to the banks. I have here a letter written on July 12 by the Cudahy Packing Co. to a Michigan bank urging them to get busy on this question; and they also say:

You may wish also to give your views to the local chamber of commerce and to the editors of your local newspapers.

There never has been such a campaign of attempt to debauch the American press—advertisements running into enormous sums, letters to the "Dear Folks" about how cheap and how fine the Wilson brands are. I hesitate to say what the evidence disclosed before the Agricultural Committee as to the amount of money being spent by the packers in advertisements, many of

them for no purpose but to sway editorial opinion; and you will not find in the great mass of newspapers in this country much discussion of these packer bills, or anything said about them. Thank God, there are some papers that can not be influenced by advertisements.

That was the letter that the Cudahy people sent out to the banks, to "get busy in the chambers of commerce" and get their support.

Then Morris & Co., on July 12, sent out a letter along the same line. These letters and circulars, as will be observed, all went out within a space of two or three days. Then the flood of telegrams and letters commenced to pour in on Congress, just about the time these letters and these circulars got out around the country.

That was not all. They called in their employees at certain places just about this time and sent them out to the retail merchants with petitions and prepared letters to send in to Members of Congress, and telegrams, at their expense. Not only that, but they had some orators connected with their organization; and I am tracing now just the sources of inspiration for these telegrams.

I have here the Stamford Advocate, of Stamford, Conn., Thursday, July 17, 1919; and Senators will discover probably that after this speech at Stamford they received a large and choice assortment of telegrams.

DENOUNCES KENYON BILL—MR. GRIFFITH INTERPRETS PENDING MEASURE FOR KIWANIS CLUB.

The Kiwanis Club had lunch to-day at noon in the Davenport. The Rome Furniture Co. provided souvenirs in the form of clothes brushes. John C. Lee provided a box of Darby and Joan perfectoes, and the club had an attendance prize in the form of a box of cigars, which was won by E. W. Lockwood, who at once opened the box and treated the club. The speaker of the day was H. M. Griffith, of the New York office of Armour & Co., who said in part:

"I thank you, gentlemen, for the opportunity of appearing here and bringing to your attention a most vicious bit of Federal legislation. I refer to the bill now known as the Kenyon bill. I shall endeavor to give a brief résumé of this remarkable bill, and regret that the time does not permit of a more exhaustive analysis.

Then he goes ahead to analyze it, and he ends with these words:

"Men of this club, the packing industry is the most regulated industry in the world. Stripped of all camouflage, this bill of Senator KENYON is a bill for Government ownership.

He deceived the Kiwanis Club in that respect.

"It is a bill for inefficiency. The Government as administered by Washington, Adams—

I should not have referred to that.

"Monroe, Lincoln, and McKinley is good enough for me!

That is the kind of a Government we are trying to keep; this, and not a Government of the packers. I realize that references to Washington may be somewhat out of place.

"Look deeper—

He said, in this magnificent peroration—

"Look deeper and you will see that this bill is an attempt to substitute the red flag of socialism for the American flag. Bolshevism is spewing its vermin into the minds of the American people.

"I say that the Government of Lincoln is good enough. How about you, gentlemen?"

On motion of Mr. Morehouse it was voted that the club telegraph both the Senators and the Congressmen that it is opposed to the Kenyon bill. The motion was carried without a dissenting vote.

A quick response from Congress:

Mr. Morehouse then read a letter from Congressman SCHUYLER MERRITT, informing the club that he would vote against the bill.

The next lunch of the club will be held at the home of the Stamford Yacht Club next Thursday.

Somebody is going to have something to say in this country about controlling prices besides the members of the Kiwanis Club and the Stamford Yacht Club. But this reference to anarchy and socialism so stirred up the community that telegrams poured in here protesting against the bill, one of them from a policeman, who feared what it was going to do in the way of bringing about anarchy.

Mr. BORAH. Where is the Kiwanis Club located?

Mr. KENYON. In Connecticut. This is from Stamford, Conn., and there are a large number of telegrams that were sent in from Stamford, Conn.

Then they also sent out a blank affair through their salesmen and branch houses asking questions. I place one in the RECORD:

Branch house _____ Salesman _____
Name _____ Address _____
Business _____

Question 1: Are you in favor of Government ownership and control of basic industries, such as railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, packing houses, etc., which, of course, would restrict competition, as outlined in the Kenyon-Kendrick bill, which is now before the United States Senate?

Answer:

Question 2: Do you prefer to purchase your supplies from the Government owned and operated packing plant or from competitive individual companies?

Answer: Yes _____ No _____ Neutral _____
Why? _____

Question 3: This is the first step toward complete Government ownership. If you do not advise your Senator and Representative at Washington, how can he act?

Being opposed to this unfair legislation, would you be willing to write your Congressman and Senator to this effect?

Answer:

Question 4: Has the letter been written? If so, when? _____

Write your letter to:

Hon. A. J. GRONNA, chairman Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, I should like to put in the RECORD the letter from Thomas E. Wilson to the stockholders of Wilson & Co.; the letter from the Cudahy Packing Co. to the bond and note holders of the Cudahy Packing Co.; the letter from Swift & Co., through their secretary, to their stockholders; and the letter to the banks. I will hand them to the reporter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHICAGO, U. S. A., July 14, 1919.

To the stockholders of Wilson & Co.:

As a stockholder of Wilson & Co. you have a voice in its management and a share in its earnings, therefore I feel you are entitled to know that pending legislation in Congress, if enacted into law, will be of considerable interest to you and to American business generally.

We are inclosing herewith for your consideration a synopsis of bill S. 2202, introduced last month by Senator W. S. KENYON, of Iowa. This bill is a fair example of others now pending in Congress. The Kenyon bill proposes to license the packers and places autocratic power over the industry.

Should this bill become a law it must be apparent that the Department of Agriculture will be given powers heretofore unheard of in American industry, practically placing our business in the hands of subordinates of that department. If this is brought about, there can be no doubt that the efficiency of the meat-packing industry will be impaired, resulting only in increased costs to the ultimate consumer.

These bills also provide that the packers shall be deprived of their ownership of refrigerator cars and of their interests in stockyards, and further limits their operations, which can result in nothing but reduced efficiency and an increased cost and difficulty in the distribution of our products.

This control is given by the establishment of a dangerous licensing system which in the course of time may become applicable to any other business.

As an investor we believe you are interested in this proposed legislation, and it would seem to us that it might be helpful to your Senator and Congressman to have the benefit of your views upon this important subject.

Very truly, yours,

THOS. E. WILSON,
President.

CHICAGO, July 11, 1919.

To our bond and note holders:

We inclose for your consideration a synopsis of bill S. 2202, introduced last month by Senator KENYON.

This bill is a fair example of other bills now pending in Congress. It proposes to license the packers and place autocratic power over the industry in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. It would deprive the packers of the control of their refrigerator cars, force them to dispose of their stockyards interests, and also aims to preclude them from engaging in any other business or in the sale or manufacture of any food product other than live-stock products.

Probably no industry is operated to-day more efficiently than the packing-house industry, or on so small a margin of profit on the turnover.

Should this bill become a law, the powers conferred on the Department of Agriculture would virtually place the industry in the hands of subordinates in the Agricultural Department; the efficiency of the industry would be impaired, and the final result would be unsatisfactory service and increased cost to the consumer.

We consider Government interference in private business, to the extent contemplated in this bill, unwarranted, and feel assured that if the packing industry comes under license it will only be a question of time before all large industries are similarly handicapped—something which would undoubtedly lead to industrial disorder and national disaster.

We think it highly desirable, in your own interest as a security holder, therefore, that you take the matter up, either personally or by letter, with your Representative and Senators in Congress, protesting against this bill; also against bill S. 2199, introduced by Senator KENDRICK, and against all other similar measures.

Kindly give this your early attention, as prompt action is necessary.

Respectfully,

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 12, 1919.

To the shareholders of Swift & Co.:

We believe that it is the duty of every shareholder of Swift & Co. to pay attention to the present situation with regard to the proposed legislation affecting the packing industry.

There are pending in the United States Senate two bills—one the Kendrick bill, introduced on June 23, known as S. 2199, and the other the Kenyon bill, introduced on the same day, and known as S. 2202. We are inclosing a summary of the Kenyon bill, which typifies the proposed legislation.

These bills are revolutionary, in that they propose to place legitimate business under a Federal license which may be arbitrarily revoked at any time, and they vest the blanket powers of directing and controlling all our operations in the hands of a Government agent who may know nothing about the business.

One of these bills specifically gives the Government the extraordinary power to say what commodities a licensee may or may not sell; the other bill probably gives the same power under its general license provisions.

These bills also provide that the packers shall be deprived of the control of their refrigerator cars and of their interests in stockyards. This will result in reduced efficiency and an increased cost and difficulty in the distribution of our products.

If these bills are passed, no business will be free from the menace of autocratic, irresponsible, bureaucratic control. They should be opposed

by every investor in every industrial enterprise, and by everyone who believes that the public interests are best served by industries under private rather than Government management.

We are confident that if given an opportunity this industry can readily prove that the proposed legislation is vicious. It is for this reason that we believe it to be your duty to interview or write your individual Congressman and your Senators to urge them to make a complete and thorough investigation before legislating upon this subject, and to urge them to oppose the pending ill-advised and destructive legislation.

Yours, truly,

SWIFT & Co.,
By F. S. HAYWARD,
Secretary.

If anyone wishes to read the complete bill, copy will be furnished on request.

CHICAGO, July 12, 1919.

DEAR SIR: We are inclosing a summary of a bill introduced in the United States Senate, which, we believe, would set a precedent for licensing and restricting all sorts of businesses.

The inclosed summary indicates the adverse effects of this legislation on the packing industry, including live-stock commission men, packers, interstate dealers in meat products, and others. You will notice that the measure proposes an elaborate licensing system and places the issuance and revocation of licenses almost wholly within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

If an employee or agent, without his principal's knowledge, fails in a single instance to comply with any of the complex regulations, the license may be forfeited.

Restrictions embodied in the bill limit the products which may be handled to a single sort. These provisions threaten economies and efficiency evolved from long experience.

May we ask that you consider the measure earnestly, then if you agree with us that it would be harmful to American industry and American business, will you not personally communicate your opinion to your Senators or Representatives in Congress, in order that they may realize how business men look upon the legislation now proposed? You may wish also to give your views to the local chamber of commerce and to the editors of your local newspapers.

You may find it convenient to mention the Kenyon bill as bill S. 2202. It is quite similar to the bill which Senator KENDRICK has introduced, S. 2199, and to Representative LEVER's bill, H. R. 5310.

Yours, very truly,

THE CUDAHY PACKING Co.,
JNO. E. WAGNER, Treasurer.

Mr. KENYON. I also wish to insert in the RECORD another statement they send out on this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHICAGO, July 12, 1919.

We are sending you with this letter an outline of a bill which, in our opinion, threatens the independence, enterprise, and efficiency of American commerce and industry. It does this by setting a precedent of laws licensing and restricting all sorts of businesses.

The bill we have summarized provides that members of a large American industry, famous for its efficiency under its present organization, shall operate under a Federal license. Under this bill the power to issue or withdraw license would be placed almost entirely within the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Furthermore, this bill, which was introduced by Senator KENYON, of Iowa, limits the companies affected to one kind of product. These restrictions would lower efficiency. While it is true that the Kenyon bill specified only the packing industry, yet the principle involved is applicable to every business. It is essentially a barrier to business enterprise and is opposed to the spirit by which American institutions have been developed.

We would appreciate your consideration of the proposed legislation and in all of its aspects. If you conclude that it embodies a dangerous principle, we hope that you will say so at once to your Senators and Representatives at Congress. Your views would gain even more force if they were communicated also to the newspapers of your city, to your business associates, and to your local trade organization.

The proposed laws are embodied in three bills—the Kenyon bill, S. 2202; the Kendrick bill, S. 2199; and the Lever bill, H. R. 5310.

Yours, truly,

C. M. MACFARLAND,
Vice President and Treasurer.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. Buckingham, the manager of the Union Stock Yards Co., at Omaha, which is controlled by these gentlemen, gave out an interview in the Omaha Bee:

Mr. Buckingham ridiculed the recent efforts of Senator KENDRICK, of Wyoming, and Senator KENYON, of Iowa, in presenting bills in Congress calling for Federal control of the packing industry, describing the bills as "fads," "ideas," and "theories" of day-dreaming politicians. "The packing business is the largest single business in the world."

Then he is inquired of concerning these bills.

"If the change comes"—

Referring to divorcing the packing houses from the stock-yards—

"What will be the effect?" Mr. Buckingham was asked.

Now, listen:

"There won't be any change," Mr. Buckingham replied. "The stock-yards and packing houses will operate just the same as usual. The yards company can be 100 miles away from the packing center, so far as we are concerned, and the industry would progress as usual. The packing business is as large as the Government itself, and it is foolish for a lot of grandstanders to theorize on how it shall be conducted."

That is the question. Maybe he is right. Maybe this arrogance of power is such that they can be as brazen about the proposition now as they desire. Maybe, with all of this control, reaching into banks and industries and railroads everywhere in

this country, they are as strong and powerful as the Government of the United States. Maybe, with the Senators who rush to their defense whenever there is anything said about them, their power may be even greater than we dream of. That is the question that the American people are going to determine. It is a good deal like the general manager of the International Harvester Co., who is reported to have said the other day, when there was a strike and he refused to open up—so the papers reported it; I hope it may not be true—"You wanted a closed shop. You have got a closed shop now, and it will stay closed until you come to our terms," or substantially that.

Gentlemen had better have a little vision in this country, Mr. President. They had better hear some of the voices in the air in this country, as well as through the world; and these gentlemen who believe that they can grow so powerful in monopolizing the things that the people of this country may have, and that Congress dare not say a word to them to control them, had better beware.

Then there came a deluge of telegrams, just like a mighty telepathic wave. All over this country it was discovered that the Kendrick bill was going to ruin the stockmen of the country. There is not a greater stockman in this country, nor a more honorable man, nor one who understands this business better, than the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. He is out there now, attending to his great stock interests. Telegrams come from Utah, saying that this is going to ruin the stock business. There is not any business on earth, according to these telegrams, that is not going to be ruined by the Kendrick bill, if it is passed.

Here is a telegram from Savannah, Ga.; and I say now that you can take the map of these different States, and you can pick out one town and the telegrams and letters that come in from that town on a certain day, and then you can figure out just about the distance a man would travel the next day, and then you will find them coming in from that town, if you just follow the map through Kentucky and Tennessee and other States. These telegrams are to the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has kindly permitted me to use them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he has any information as to who pays for this enormous mass of telegraphic matter?

Mr. KENYON. I have.

Mr. THOMAS. Is the Senator prepared to inform the Senate?

Mr. KENYON. I am, just as soon as I can reach it, and show the Senator the absolute forms that were prepared, with the Senator's name, and even what should be said to him.

Mr. THOMAS. The forms of the telegrams I have received are nearly all identical.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have received a great many telegrams, apparently for the most part alike. One day I will get 40 or 50 from Memphis, and another day 40 or 50 from Chattanooga, or maybe 100; more from Chattanooga than anywhere else. Again, Nashville will have a day, and I will get a great many from Nashville. Has the Senator any information in reference to how it happens that a peculiar propaganda is started in that way, and upon whom it operates?

Mr. KENYON. The Senator surely does not think it could be a propaganda. Of course, it is merely the spontaneous outburst of the minds of all of the American people against this throttling of their business, and it happens on almost the same day. It is the most wonderful psychological event that ever has been exhibited to the world.

Here is a telegram from Savannah, Ga., protesting against the Kenyon and Kendrick bills as being un-American. That is dated the 18th, just about time for these circulars to reach there.

From the same place, and on the same date, a telegram protesting against the Kendrick and Kenyon bills as unconstitutional. Another protesting against the Kendrick and Kenyon bills as being detrimental to retail merchants.

Here is a telegram from Gladstone, Mich., saying:

We protest against the Kenyon bill. This is no time to experiment with Government operation. From our experience in the meat business, we do not want Government control.

I will not read the signatures. They are here if any Senators want to examine them.

Another:

We protest against the Kenyon bill. This is no time to experiment with Government operation. From our experience in the meat business, we do not want Government control.

There are two minds there that work out in absolutely the same way, and use the same language.

Another one:

We protest against the Kenyon bill. This is no time to experiment with Government operation. From our experience in the meat business, we do not want Government control.

And another one just exactly like it from another place—the same language from different places. What humbug, to try and influence Members of Congress by that.

Seattle, Wash., seems to have become tremendously excited over this matter; and on the 18th, just about time for the circulars to get out there, telegrams of this kind commenced to pour in on the chairman of the committee:

Opposed Kenyon bill licensing packers. Legislation this character fosters unrest and Bolshevism. Am willing come Washington testify connection Kenyon bill.

Again, from Seattle:

The proposed Kenyon bill, if passed, would be very unsatisfactory to myself, as it should also be in the eyes of any intelligent American citizen who wishes to make his home in a free country among liberty-loving people.

Rainier Packing Co.—I do not know anything about it, but I will gamble that that is a concern controlled by some of the five big packers.

Here is another telegram from Seattle:

Kenyon bill licensing packers unfair, un-American. Kill it.

Another one wires from Seattle:

I am opposed to Kenyon bill, regulating the meat industry of the country. It is the most dastardly thing ever perpetrated on the American people

Here is another one from Seattle:

Am opposed to Kenyon bill. Absolutely unconstitutional.

Why, these people, bless their souls, never saw the bill, never looked into it, and do not know anything that is in it.

Here is a telegram from another gentleman in Seattle:

Absolutely against proposed bill licensing packers. Since when have American people lost the right to conduct their own business as they see fit?

That is the point; they have lost it. When any business becomes such a monopoly that it threatens the very life of the people of the country, they have lost that right. That doctrine has gone, and it is not Bolshevism to say so, either.

Another reads:

I am not in favor of Kenyon-Kendrick bill, which I think jeopardizes American liberty, and certainly hope the committee will not be influenced by such socialistic ideas.

These telegrams are all along about the 16th to the 18th, three and four days after the circular letters to which I have referred were sent out.

Again:

If measures such as Kenyon bill be allowed to pass, where are our much talked of rights as American citizens?

Where are they? That is the question.

To say I am opposed to it is putting it much too mildly.

Here is a Stamford telegram. After the wonderful speech at the Kiwanis Club and before the Stamford Yacht Club, then we will be getting more telegrams. Here is a telegram from a judge in Stamford. He signs it "Judge." I have always been suspicious of the legal ability of a man who signs his personal letters as judge, but that should receive great weight with you.

Hope you can use your efforts to defeat Kenyon-Kendrick bill now before United States Senate. We do not want such action in this glorious country.

Another one, this from Seattle again:

I am opposed to the Kenyon bill in regard to Government licensing industry. Let it alone.

Ah, that is it.

Here is a very amiable man from Seattle, who says—and it costs money to send these dispatches from Seattle:

I can not conceive why such a measure as proposed Kenyon bill has been allowed to be introduced. Am unalterably opposed to it.

That is by Charles Gearhart, coffee restaurant. There is an aroma of strength about that telegram. [Laughter.] This gentleman can not understand why such a measure should be allowed to be introduced in the American Congress. Charlie had better keep to his coffee business and let the packers pay for his telegrams.

Here is another one from Seattle:

I am opposed to passage or even consideration of Kenyon bill licensing packers, an infringement upon American liberty.

So much for Seattle.

Here is West Virginia, having caught this same spirit:

Somebody having a little stock has gone to this gentleman named Gum and told him to stick to this thing and send in a dispatch; so Mr. Gum sends this dispatch from Ronceverte, W. Va., July 15:

Kenyon and Kendrick bills regulating packers should be dismissed.

He thinks this is a court action.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman may regard your bill as a bill in equity.

Mr. KENYON. He has gummed it up a good deal.

From Clifton Forge, Va., see this bunch of telegrams:

Kenyon and Kendrick bill relative to meat should not be passed.

That was July 14. Here is another one:

Kendrick and Kenyon bill—

They change it just a little—

relative to meat should not be passed.

July 14, another one:

Kendrick and Kenyon meat bill should not be passed.

Another one from Clifton Forge:

Kenyon and Kendrick meat bill should not be passed.

It is wonderful how these people all agree down there in Virginia. Here is another one. Notice the difference:

Kenyon and Kendrick meat bill should not be passed.

Here is another one from the same place, July 14. Note that:

Kendrick—

Not Kenyon and Kendrick, but—

Kendrick and Kenyon bills relative to meat should not be passed.

You can not fool these boys. They know how to do this. They will change a few words and then nobody in Congress will ever suspect them. They are wise boys.

Then another one:

Kendrick and Kenyon bills relative to meat should not be passed.

I dislike to keep reading these, but they are interesting.

Here is another one from the same place, of the same date:

Kendrick and Kenyon bills relative to meat should not be passed.

Mr. THOMAS. That sounds like an anthem.

Mr. KENYON. One feels like singing it. Here is another one, the same thing, July 14, Clifton Forge. Let me read one in full:

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,

Chairman Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Kendrick and Kenyon bills relative to meat should not be passed.

SELMA MYER CO.

CLIFTON FORGE, VA.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,

Chairman Agricultural Committee.

Kendrick and Kenyon bills relative to meat should not be passed.

This thing is pretty nearly unanimous down at Clifton Forge. Again:

CLIFTON FORGE, VA., July 14.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA:

Kendrick and Kenyon bills relative to meat should not be passed.

We will pass from Clifton Forge to something else. Here is one from Pekin, Ill., dated July 18:

I protest against Senate bill 2202—

These representatives tell them to write and refer to the bill as 2202—

as unfair to the packers and their customers. It is too autocratic and un-American in character for any American soldier to approve. Wish you would use your influence to stop this bill.

JOHN ZIMMERMAN.

Here is one from Trinity Cotton Oil Co., of Texas. They are vitally interested, they say, as they are the largest consumers of our production of the cottonseed oil.

Here is an attorney from Stamford. I do not know whether he is a member of the Kiwanis Club or the yacht club:

I have read provisions of the Kenyon bill which seem to be vicious and disastrous to business. Hope it will not pass.

He signs it as "attorney," same as the judge.

SPRINGFIELD.

We oppose the Kenyon bill. Believe it is un-American.

This is from Illinois. It will please the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

Believe it is un-American and will harm larger concerns who have helped all retail concerns in profiteering.

I think that must be a mistake, but I will have to let it go as it is. Far be it from me to accuse the packers of any profiteering.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., July 18.

At a meeting of retail butchers and grocers, of which I am a member, a meeting was held and all decided that the Kendrick bill ought to be killed.

Another one from Bridgeport:

Kendrick bill would be against best interests of public. Packers are giving us food cheaper than could get it any other way. I protest against its passage.

This gentleman labors under the belief that he is getting his food cheaper; that by virtue of the packers it is cheaper than it would be otherwise. Of course, if that is true probably nothing ought to be done.

Another gentleman, from Rochester, N. Y.:

Defeat Kenyon-Kendrick bill, which is now before the United States Senate. Government control of packing industry would be an impossibility.

Another from Bridgeport, Conn.:

Butchers and grocers held meeting in Bridgeport and talked over bill introduced by Mr. KENDRICK and decided that this bill would be against our interest, and I hope the bill will be killed.

Here is another one from Bridgeport:

I am opposed to Kendrick bill. Kill it.

H. COHEN.

Here is another one from Bridgeport:

I am opposed to Kendrick bill. It is ridiculous. Kill it.

There is a sanguinary lot of people living around Bridgeport apparently.

Here is a more reasonable gentleman:

I protest against Kendrick bill. If passed, it would be against best interests of my business. Hope to see it has fair consideration and finally killed.

Like the justice of the peace who took the case under advisement, with the statement that he would decide for the plaintiff in three days. [Laughter.]

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y.

We, the members of Mount Vernon Business Men's Association, Mount Vernon, at a meeting held Thursday, July 17, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we regard the Kenyon bill as un-American and wish to register our formal protest against passage of same.

"MOUNT VERNON BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION."

Does anybody on the face of the earth even believe that the Mount Vernon Business Men's Association ever considered this bill or knew anything that is in it except as may have been told them by some representative of the packers?

It may be well that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is in the far West, where he is perfectly safe, because from the tenor of some of these telegrams it would seem as if the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Iowa, even for introducing bills and asking any consideration of them, ought to be taken out and shot at sunrise.

Here is a gentleman from Virginia who telegraphs:

Down with the Kenyon bill.

Another one from Albany, Oreg., July 15:

As a man interested in welfare of country, I beg you to use your influence to defeat Kenyon bill.

Here is another one wired from Moscow, Idaho, protesting and saying it would—

Disrupt not only meat business, but the entire business structure of this country.

Here is a gentleman from Washington, an interesting one:

Senator ASLE J. GRONNA,

Chairman Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Opposed to Kenyon bill licensing packers. Should receive no consideration.

A. ABRAHAM.

If I had received that telegram before introducing the bill, I should have been constrained not to do it.

Here are others from Bremerton, Wash. Here is a very interesting dispatch from Florida:

Opposed to Kenyon bill. High cost of living reduced by competition. No reason to cut it off.

A man who can understand that the high cost of living has been reduced ought to have his head X-rayed, so that the picture may be given to the rest of the Nation to understand how a man can think that way. So this gentleman does not want anything done about these bills, because the high cost of living has been reduced by competition between the packers.

Here is another man from West Virginia, who wires:

Kenyon and Kendrick bill relative packers should be stopped. Kill them, stop them, end them in some way.

Here is another from Florida, who wires:

If this Kenyon bill passes, I can see my finish as a butcher.

NATHAN ABRAHAMSON.

[Laughter.]

Here is another one from Seattle:

I am opposed to Kenyon bill regulating packing industry of this country. Contrary to rights of free thinking people.

Here is a postmaster down in Cape Charles, Va. I wonder how he got into this thing. He wires the chairman:

I oppose Kenyon bill, Senate 2202, very much.

W. B. BULL, Postmaster.

Mr. President, here is a bunch of one-half the telegrams that a certain Senator has received. They run along in this same way. I am not going to take the time of the Senate to go over them. I think I have connected up pretty well these telegrams and the telegrams the Senators have been receiving with circulars that have gone out from the packers.

Now, what about the letters? You have received stacks upon stacks of letters. I have some of them here that I have authority to use as showing the similarity, but I think I will not take the time to go over them. But here are a number that I want to refer to. Here is a large number of letters from Nashville, Tenn. In many instances they are written on a typewriter evidently by people who were not the signers of the letters. Others were even written in longhand and then signed by a person whose signature is entirely different from the body of the letter. There are others that are exactly alike and the wording exactly alike, signed, some of them, by people down at the bottom of the page, evidently not the person constructing the letter, and others in different places on the page. The typewriting, the paper, the words are all alike. Here is a very large assortment from Nashville. Here is another assortment almost identical from Rahway, N. J., paper alike, typewriting alike, evidently all prepared, and then signed by people sometimes down at the bottom of the page. These are interesting to look at if anybody cares to do it. I am not going to spend time upon them.

From Denver, Colo., there are a large number exactly alike, sent in on July 14, just at the proper time to hear from those circulars. Then I have some without any towns on at all. Here is a large number from Cedar Rapids, in my State, practically alike, prepared evidently by some one with the same sized paper for each one, the same typewriter, and signed by various people of Cedar Rapids, where, by the way, they have a packing house controlled by one of the large packers.

Here are different places through New Jersey, showing how the campaign is on; through Massachusetts; through Kentucky, a large number from Ansonia, Ky., all alike; others from Derby, Conn., same typewriting, same paper, almost the same language, signed up by people whom they have called upon and asked to do it; some from Vermont, Arkansas, and Massachusetts. Here are some from North Adams, Mass. They seem to have had a very prosperous day at North Adams. Some from New Bedford, Mass.; Westfield, Mass.; Chrome, N. J.; some from Denver, Colo.; Muskogee, Okla.; Adams, Mass. I am not going to weary you with these things, but I want to refer now to some things that have come in showing how the job has been done that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] asked me about.

I do not know whether I ought to use this man's name. Here is the statement by a certain employee:

Mr. Lee Armour, manager, told me that if Government took over packing industry there would be no more deliveries.

Statement by another Armour employee at Stamford, Conn.:

I was told if the Government took over packing houses they would centralize plants and a lot of us would lose our jobs.

Statement by another one:

I was told that if Government supervises packers they would also take over retailers who did business of a certain amount, and we would have a Government employee in our establishment; also that everything would have to be paid for in cash, as there would be no more credit.

Here is a gentleman who writes to me as to their procedure at Hartford, Conn.:

Senator KENTON, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A special representative of Swift & Co. called here on me at my store to-day. In one hand was a copy of the Kenyon bill and in the other a petition for me to sign. Here follows the conversation:

Swift's man: "Here is a law that Congress proposes to enact, and if it passes you are driven out of business, for the prices of all packing-house products will immediately rise to such a point that none but the very wealthy will be able to buy these products, and you have not got any of this class of trade. The packers are your friends, and we want you to sign this petition as a protest against this bill. We will see that you lose nothing by doing it."

Here is this merchant's answer:

I have been handling packing-house products since 1904, having retailed last year \$212,000 worth of them. Up to January 1 last I was just \$1,800 richer than in 1904. There is absolutely no escape for me, being compelled to buy every slaughtered animal, together with every piece, part, or trimming thereof that enters into my store from Swift & Co., Armour & Co., Cudahy & Co., Morris & Co., and Wilson & Co., they being all one and the same, with the result that I am obliged to pay any price they see fit to ask, and these prices are always identically the same. For years I have been obliged to daily rob every customer that buys bacon, ham, pork loins, etc., by making them pay from 38 cents to 50 cents per pound for extra heavy paper, burlap, string, etc., which these packers willfully place so abundantly around about these goods, as I am obliged to pay you for all of this stuff. I am obliged to sell you back at whatever price you see fit to pay, all my bones, tallow, scrap, etc., as you positively own the only rendering collecting agency in this city for these goods. Not satisfied with what you have, you have been and still are carrying on a systematic, fiendish, and devilish crusade against every wholesale distributor of butter, cheese, eggs, and poultry, maliciously underselling these legitimate distributors in your decision to swiftly eliminate them and gain the same control over production and outletting as you now have on packing-house products, and if you lose a few million dollars in killing off these people a twist of 2 or 3 cents a pound on packing-house products for a few days will more than make up.

You have the farmers that produce live stock all over the world now by the throat, and you are now after the product of this live stock while it is alive, namely, milk. You have near control over milk condenseries, and as soon as you control the cheese and butter business you will be in control of the entire milk production. Further, if I do not buy these lines from you I am virtually put out of the beef and allied lines. You now come to me with nearly a demand to eliminate all my wholesale grocery friends of years standing and buy from you canned goods of every description, coffee, cereals, produce, and, in fact, nearly everything sold in a grocery store. Just take your petition and yourself out of my presence, for you are a perfect bane to my existence.

I leave out a personal reference. Then he continues:

If this monopoly, unspeakable and unparalleled in the history of the world, is not squelched absolute riotous anarchy will result.

That language is probably too strong. I do not mean to indorse any such language, but it shows how people can be worked up by the possibility of the destruction of their business.

Every fool that runs knows well that these five corporations have the packing-house business in all its ramifications tied up beyond description, and as a result of this monopoly the enormous profits which they are making permits them to slaughter every human being, firm, or corporation engaged in any other line of business that they see fit and set out to devour, and they are engaged in this operation from dawn to dawn every day.

Being a retailer and at the mercy of these wolves, I regret that I can not make known my name to you, for if I did, and they knew I wrote this letter, I am doomed.

I have a letter from the director of the Southern Wholesale Grocers' Association. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] in his usual positive way stated that this is a fight between the packers and the wholesale grocers. It is not, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. The propaganda is.

Mr. KENYON. Where is the wholesale-grocery propaganda? Will the Senator from Utah produce a single letter sent out by the Southern Wholesale Grocers' Association or any other asking for support of this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not here to defend the packers, nor am I here to criticize the National Wholesale Grocers' Association.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator was very quick to say that it is a fight between the wholesale grocers and the packers.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator put in the RECORD only yesterday—

Mr. KENYON. Against the propaganda of the packers.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; and that is what the Senator from Utah stated.

Mr. KENYON. All right. I have not any doubt the wholesale grocers are going to get behind the legislation to control the packers. I hope they will. I hope we will have their help, as well as the help of the ordinary folks around the country. We will get a few of those, but if the Senator believes that they have anything to do with the introduction of these bills, he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah does not believe any such thing. The Senator does not believe they had anything to do with the propaganda of the packers. That propaganda started with the packers just the same as propaganda by the farmers started for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. There is no difference at all. What the Senator from Utah complains of is that with reference to every piece of legislation which comes to Congress there is a propaganda started either for it or against it. The Senator from Iowa knows that.

Mr. KENYON. I am inclined to agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. What I objected to was filling the RECORD with that sort of stuff, for I call it "stuff." What effect do all the telegrams and letters to which the Senator has been referring have upon the Senate? These letters and telegrams came to the chairman of the committee and I have not any doubt at all if I had received them I would have paid no more attention to them than I would to that much trash. That is the position of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator think when he gets dispatches from his State from reputable men, they are trash?

Mr. SMOOT. When a number of telegrams come to me in exactly the same words from people in my State who I know are not interested in the business, then I pay no attention to them whatever, I will say frankly to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I think that is perfectly true of the Senator. I hope they do not have any effect.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that whenever a petition comes to me and I know the parties from my State from whom it comes and I know they know what they are talking about, and know they are interested in the legislation as affecting the country rather than an individual or a business, I am interested in it, but otherwise I pay no attention to it.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, it is getting so Senators can not answer their mail. Every question that comes up, along comes some tremendous propaganda.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that so far as the Senator from Utah is concerned, I do answer them, but I have a form of a letter and I run it off in just the same number as the letters that I receive, as well as the number of petitions.

Mr. KENYON. We are straight on that now.

This letter from Mr. Heney, director of the Southern Wholesale Grocers' Association, submits evidence showing the method being used by the meat packers to secure names for petitions and telegrams. He sends copies of the telegrams such as already referred to when the Senator from Colorado asked me the question. He sends copies of telegrams to the different retail dealers to send in to the Senate and to the House. Here is a form address, all prepared, for Hon. LEE OVERMAN, United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Am opposed to Kenyon bill.

This goes ahead, "Charge account message to dated, number of words," and so forth. He writes that these telegrams were furnished and paid for by the packers.

Mr. SMOOT. In this connection, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. With reference to the number of letters the Senator has referred to to-day and the telegrams, I have not any doubt but what most of them have been paid for by the packers. I called attention only day before yesterday, I think it was, to a propaganda that was started here by one of the departments. The Joint Committee on Printing held hearings a week ago last Monday in relation to continuing or discontinuing certain governmental publications. Immediately a propaganda was started, before any action was taken by the committee.

I think I have received as many telegrams and as many letters upon the question of the Reclamation Record as the Senator from Iowa has presented here to the Senate to-day, and that propaganda came from the department. What I object to is that kind of propaganda, and I would like the country to understand that that kind of propaganda or the propaganda that is referred to by the Senator to-day cuts no figure, and it might as well be considered to be a waste of money.

Mr. KENYON. I am glad of that, and I think it will be a good thing to get that idea before the country. I hope the Senator will in his forceful way blow up that propaganda, as I am trying to do this one.

The Reynolds-Davis Grocery Co. wired me from Fort Smith, Ark., from whence I produce a number of telegrams:

FORT SMITH, ARK., July 17, 1919.

Hon. WILLIAM S. KENYON,
Washington, D. C.:

The packers have their salesmen working this week on retail merchants, trying to get them to wire and write their Congressmen and Senators to oppose your bill. They are telling merchants your bill is against public good, and using every other argument they can to try and defeat it.

REYNOLDS-DAVIS GROCERY CO.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., July 17, 1919.

Senator WILLIAM S. KENYON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Present packers' campaign of misrepresentation and insidious influence to induce flood of letters and wires to Congress against Kenyon bill should be exposed by you.

LEWIS H. HANEY,

HUNTSVILLE, ALA., July 19, 1919.

Senator KENYON,
Washington, D. C.:

Investigation shows the protests against Kenyon bill coming from merchants in this vicinity were solicited and written by representatives of the packers, senders not being required to pay for messages. It also appears some of the senders do not know what they are protesting against.

That is certainly true. This telegram is signed by W. L. Halsey Grocery Co., Huntsville Grocery Co., Alabama Grocery Co., Gudenrath & Hall, Lyle & Lyle.

Here is a letter from Connecticut, which is as follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., July 16, 1919.

GENTLEMEN: I am inclosing you what the Big Four packers are requesting the retail grocer to sign and using all kinds of arguments to induce said retailer to sign in opposition to the Kenyon-Kendrick bill (S. 2202).

One of our salesmen was handed the inclosed by a customer and asked what he should do with it. Our salesman told him to say, "No; I am not opposed to the bill." Continuing the conversation, he said: "I guess I won't do anything about it. The packers are bigger than the Congress of the United States and will get what they want."

This is the general feeling in our section. New Haven is a city of 175,000, and has in it more than 800 retail grocers struggling to get a living. Forty-five per cent of them could not live if it were not for the wholesale grocer.

It does seem to us that the packers are going beyond their limit in trying to control all food products, and their methods in the past do not show that any benefit has resulted to the general public or to anyone except the packers themselves.

They ask the question, "Are you familiar with the proposed legislation, which would restrict competition in the wholesale grocery business and prevent concerns such as the Chicago packers from selling grocery products?" and trying to show by this that the wholesale grocery does not want competition. I have been in the wholesale grocery business more than 40 years, and I have never seen competition so strong among the wholesale grocers as it is to-day—that is, among themselves.

It is a grave question: Should the meat packers of the country absorb and control the distribution of food products?

That is the question presented by the bill I have introduced. I have other letters showing how this propaganda has been carried on throughout the country. I think I shall not take the time, however, to refer to them. This contest is not going to be all one sided. I am glad these gentlemen have stirred the thing up, because the people of the country are going to begin to see what this measure is, just how it is going to affect the packers, and just what the packers are doing. They are going to begin to study the report of the Federal Trade Commission—I hope we may have extra copies of it printed—and also the letter of the Federal Trade Commission to the President. The people are realizing, even if Congress is not, that the packers are reaching out into all of these lines of industry. I have referred to these letters merely to show the sources from which these telegrams came.

I will discuss the bill at some later time. There will undoubtedly be many amendments to the bill in committee; it may never be reported out; entirely new bills may be reported out. There will be absolutely no hurry; it is too important a question to the packers, to business, and to the people of this country to have any ill-considered legislation; but the activities of these gentlemen now are extending into fertilizer, eggs, cheese, butter, rice, breakfast foods, canned vegetables, soda-fountain supplies, and many other lines. Some of them are the owners of grain-elevator companies. Some are in the American International Corporation, with its shipping interests, and some of their subsidiaries grow tropical fruits in Hawaii; others are reaching into the salmon fisheries of Alaska; others are canning shrimps taken from the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. They have gotten into the wool business and the rice business. Perhaps it may go on, and anyone who says a word about this or tries to do anything in an humble way to stop it is playing politics and is a general all-around nuisance. Perhaps that is so; perhaps the people of this country do not care if monopolization is established in everything that they have to eat; perhaps they do not; but I have an idea that they do; that they are going to be heard from; and that the propaganda, if it may so be called, will not be all upon one side.

The city council of Quincy, Ill., passed some very interesting resolutions on last Monday evening, July 14, which were proposed by Alderman Hyatt. They are very short; I do not indorse the language of the resolutions; but I do not think they will shock anybody very much. They show, however, that some of the everyday folk are waking up to the situation and that the packers' propaganda has aroused others. I ask that the resolutions be read at the desk, Mr. President, if there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas Congress, Senate and House, have year after year, from time to time, sent out committees to investigate the octopus, commonly called the "Packing Trust"; and

Whereas year after year these committees have returned reports adverse to the combine, then went to sleep or camouflaged the issue by allowing these big packers to combine and control the markets in which they buy, as well as control the markets in which they sell, and rob the masses; and

Whereas a majority of the House and Senate have kept one eye shut, ever and always helping this band of insane money grabbers to throttle competition and substitute one of the most gigantic monopolies ever instituted by men; and

Whereas Senator WILLIAM S. KENYON, of Iowa, has a bill now before the Senate in favor of controlling this damnable trust, forcing them to lower the price of food to the masses, take the Government out of their greedy clutches, and follow the Constitution of the United States instead of the stolen constitution they have been following for years, with the motto, "The public be damned": Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body, selected to safeguard and fight the battles of 40,000 constituents, instruct the city clerk to forward to Senator KENYON a copy of this resolution with the thanks of the Quincy city council for his efforts to put these two-legged profit hogs under license and regulate them and compel them to work under the time-honored principle of supply and demand in order to save this grand Government from revolution; be it further

Resolved, That our Representatives and Senators vote for the people in their districts instead of for the packing trust, that, if not checked, will become a menace to liberty and civilization, and in this resolution we warn our congressional representatives that this council's hand will show in this district, and that therefore we advise that Senator KENYON'S bill be adopted as drafted and that it must not be cut to pieces by cunningly worded amendments and loaded down with technicalities.

Mr. KENYON. I think, perhaps, I ought not to have had those resolutions read in the Senate. The language is too strong. I do not indorse that language at all, and I am rather

surprised that the city council of Quincy should have adopted such strong language.

Mr. THOMAS. It sounds a little like some of the arguments on the league of nations.

Mr. KENYON. Well, I think we never get anywhere by abusive language.

Here is a dispatch I have received from Butte, Mont., which reads:

BUTTE, MONT., July 22, 1919.

Senator KENYON,

The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Butte Central Labor Council, Butte, representing about 12,000 members, indorses Senate bill 2202 and has instructed affiliated locals to take similar action.

JOHN GREEN, Secretary.

So this fight is not going to be an absolutely one-sided affair. Mr. President, I have said about all I am going to say, and I did not really want to say anything, but felt it my duty to show how this propaganda is being carried on. I think that Senators and the great business interests ought to read an article in the Journal of Commerce of July 14. The Journal of Commerce of New York certainly can not be accused of being a Bolshevik organ or an exceedingly radical organ. I understand it is an ultraconservative organ and has often been accused of being a spokesman of the great interests. I want to read briefly from it. The language is worthy of thought. The article is headed "Offense of the packers" and reads:

Such response as the "Big Five," who are trying to monopolize the food trade of the country, make to the charges of the Federal Trade Commission consists mainly of a claim that what they have done and are doing is for the benefit of the country and its people. That is the familiar claim of all autocratic power, however it may be constituted and whatever its purpose. The preliminary report of the commission to the President covers a wide field and deals with a variety of activities, besides the slaughter of cattle and sheep and the control of markets and of foreign trade in beef and mutton. That is a familiar story. There is a claim that they are not combined and have no agreement as to quantities dealt in or prices charged, and consequently commit no violation of the antimonopoly policy of the Government. It is a well-known and undeniable fact that there was a combination and a close cooperation in building up the vast control that has been established. While that has been nominally abandoned, and there is no formal agreement such as the law forbids, there is in fact a mutual understanding and cooperation on a common basis that makes the maintenance of effective competition impossible.

One of the chief claims is that this vast combination is the effect of adjusting the food supply to the demand in a way to make the cost economical and the price moderate, with only a small percentage of profit for the huge corporations, and figures are given out to convince of this. But the expanded capital has been largely worked out of past profits turned into forms of investment in the business, and whether prices are higher or lower than they would otherwise be can not be calculated from the figures presented. The huge control through the several centers for collecting material and distributing products determines the price of the animals at the yards and of the meat and other products in the markets. This powerful control extends in no small measure to those who raise the sheep and cattle and, to a less extent, the hogs and leaves them no freedom in the markets. It extends also to the agencies for distributing the products of slaughterhouses to the markets for food not only by wholesale but by retail through cities and towns. It does not apply to meat alone, for skins, horns, hoofs, and bones have been utilized and made profitable. This is claimed as a merit and a benefit to the public; and so it is in effect, but it is not necessary to constitute and maintain a monopoly to attain such results. When that is done it greatly enriches the few and hampers the competitive efforts of the many.

But this monopolizing and profiting process on a great scale has by no means been confined to stock farms, butcher shops, and meat markets. It has been extended to many other articles of food, dairy products, grain, and fruit, and even to building material in no small measure, because in collecting, transporting, and distributing on such an immense scale all these things can be worked in with the rest at reduced cost and with increased profit, crowding out or restricting competition on any effective scale. The advantage of this has come largely from means of storage, transportation, and distribution from central market places the country over. The companies have built up and maintained extensive packing places and adapted them to a variety of storage purposes, reducing the cost per unit and monopolizing their use. This has been carried on on no small scale into railroad transportation and delivery. The National Wholesale Grocers' Association submitted a complaint to the Interstate Commerce Commission only a short time ago of discrimination granted to these packing combinations by railroads in the cost of carrying their commodities. The packers, not only of meat but of many other things, have yards of their own with cars and tracks and means of loading and unloading and cars for transportation to distant markets for their own exclusive use. They also have special contracts with railroad companies, according to this charge of the grocers, which discriminates on a generous scale in their favor and to their advantage and profit in distributing commodities.

It is easy to claim for this kind of monopolizing a public benefit and a diminution in the cost of living. This might be the case if it were carried on in an ideal and unselfish manner for the common welfare. That is, it might be made a benefit in a pecuniary sense, assuming that it was conducted with such high motives; but even then it would be the opposite of the benefit in its effect upon public and personal interests and rights. It would deaden competition and rivalry in all the productive activities and restrain ambition for success in life. This would be a degenerating and corrupting evil, to the ruin of national character and of real enterprise, lowering the morale of the whole Nation. Anything more inconsistent with the principle and spirit of genuine Americanism is hardly conceivable, and it is of the utmost consequence that it be stopped, and that the ways be open and free for the energies of American life in a normal state of health and activity.

If all the claims of the packers were conceded, the fact would remain that they still control the meat supply of the United States; that they dominate numerous related industries; and that they are extending their activities in so many other directions as to openly threaten the natural freedom of trade.

No matter how plausible the answers of the packers may seem, they have acquired a power over highly important lines of industry which, if not curbed, will assuredly lead to a fresh outbreak of monopoly, with all its attendant social and economic dangers. Such power, however carefully exercised when under suspicion, is sure to be abused at the first opportunity, for history proves that few men can resist the temptations of unrestrained power, and, rightly or wrongly, the man in the street will grow jealous of this power over his food supply, affording the wily politician a fruitful opportunity to flay the wicked packer.

Judging by their recent propaganda—

Remember, this is from a friendly organ—

the packers must have already read the handwriting on the wall, and presumably they recognize that if their present monopolistic tendencies continue they must prepare to accept one of two alternatives, either Government regulation or Government ownership. Surely they do not intend to precipitate the latter by defiance of public opinion; and it is hardly to be supposed they will seriously oppose the former. If the people should have to choose—

And it would be well to remember this—

between exploitation by the food barons or socialization by the Government, it is easy to see where their choice will fall. That some curb upon the overgrasping monopolistic tendencies of the packers will be applied is practically certain.

The bill concerning which there has been so much talk is not a Government-ownership bill. I am not in favor of and would not introduce a bill for Government ownership of the packing industry. It is merely a bill seeking to regulate the packers—stringent, yes; radical, yes; but the things we now think are radical in five years we may not think are radical through a licensing system, concerning which there may be very valid objection; but it seems to be the only method in sight now; through a divorcement of the stockyards from the ownership of the packers, a divorcement of private cars from their control, and the power to keep them out of unrelated businesses. I grant that presents a radical field, far-reaching in its consequences, one which ought to have the most serious consideration of the committee and Congress, and it will have. Public opinion ought not to be swayed by manufactured propaganda on either side.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I apprehend that very likely some Senators will desire to respond to the address of the Senator from Iowa or, perhaps, to discuss further the subject he has presented to the Senate, but I am going to appeal to Senators who may feel so disposed to defer until some other time anything they may care to present upon that subject, which is not before the Senate in the bill under consideration. The bill under consideration is the Agricultural appropriation bill. It carries the usual appropriations for the Forestry Service. My State is burning up; there are furious fires raging in practically all of the national forests in the State; the Forestry Service has a force of 2,500 men in the field to-day, without a dollar to pay them, the appropriation, of course, having expired on the 30th day of last June. They are really conducting the work at this time practically in defiance of law, for, as I have said, they have not a dollar to pay the men who are employed. I trust, therefore, that we may look to Senators to defer further discussion of this particular subject.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I had expected to follow up what has been said by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] with a short discussion as to the extent of the business controlled by the packers in this country as well as in Argentina and Great Britain, but, out of deference to the request made by the Senator from Montana, and he is well justified in making the request, I shall defer what I desire to say on the subject until a more opportune time.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I thank the Senator very much indeed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment reported by the committee.

The SECRETARY. On page 102, after line 3, it is proposed to insert:

That any homestead settler or entryman who, during the calendar year 1919, finds it necessary to leave his homestead to seek employment in order to obtain food and other necessities of life for himself, family, and work stock, because of great and serious drought conditions, causing total or partial failures of crops, may, upon filing with the register and receiver proof of such conditions in the form of a corroborated affidavit, be excused from residence upon his homestead during all or part of the calendar year 1919, or the current year of such homestead which may fall principally in the year 1919, and in the making of final proof upon such an entry absence granted under this act shall be counted and construed as constructive residence by said homesteader.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in requesting Senators to allow this bill to pass. The Agricultural Department is without funds, although not only in the State of Montana but in other sections in the western portion of the country fires are raging and timber is burning up. This bill is exactly in the form as passed by the House, with the exception of the amendment just read at the desk. The daylight-saving provision has been eliminated. The amendment reported by the committee simply provides that entrymen who have taken homesteads may be permitted to leave their homesteads during the year 1919 to enable them to go to work and in that way make a living. I do not think any Senator or any Member of the House of Representatives can possibly have any objection to that amendment. It does not carry a single cent of appropriation. The labor is needed. In my State, in the State of Minnesota, and in all of the grain States we will be glad to get this labor, and certainly the entrymen ought to be permitted to leave their homesteads and go out and make a living for themselves and their families.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, do I understand that this bill is the same, with the exception of the elimination of the daylight-saving provision and the amendment of which the Senator now speaks, as the bill passed by the Senate at this session and vetoed by the President?

Mr. GRONNA. Exactly; and it is in the same form as it was passed by the House, with the exception of the amendment referred to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, a bill embodying the amendment reported by the committee is before the Public Lands Committee of the Senate in exactly the words of the provision found in this bill. It is true that a point of order could be made against the amendment, but I sincerely hope that no Senator will make such a point. All that has been said in relation to the necessity of the amendment is proper and right, and I will add that so far as the Public Lands Committee of the Senate is concerned they have already authorized a favorable report upon the measure which has been referred to them, and if in conference the Senate committee amendment is not agreed to by the House, a report from the Public Lands Committee on the measure referred to will be made at once, with a request for unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill, so that we may secure the legislation in that way.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am very glad that this amendment has the hearty approval of the chairman of the committee, and I am glad to hear him give the reasons for it. He has done so in a very clear and concise manner. The amendment is designed to meet the most terrible calamity that has ever visited the Northwestern States, and I hope it will be adopted without objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on page 101, beginning with line 20, I move to strike out down to and including the word "sale," on page 102. The provision which I move to strike out reads as follows:

That the word "package," where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include and shall be construed to include wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale.

I wish to take a few moments to state the reasons why I move the amendment. I take it for granted that no Senator wishes by the adoption of this provision to impose upon the consumer an expense beyond question of between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000 and perhaps of from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 or even more than that. I wish to say now that, in my mind, without a question, if the provision becomes a law, the consuming public, paying the extremely high prices they are already paying for bacon and for ham, will be assessed many, many million dollars more. The adoption of this provision for branding the weight on every ham and package of bacon will result in an added cost of nearly 4 cents per ham or package of bacon. There are on the average about 150,000,000 hams packed each year. An average added expense of 4 cents each would involve an amount of between five and six million dollars, which will necessarily be incurred without the consumer receiving one penny of benefit.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to explain in detail the reason for my position. There are no two hams that weigh exactly the same. It is held by every court, as well as by the Agricultural Department, that the wrapping of hams

and bacon in paper, or whatever the container may be, is for the purpose of keeping them clean and for the preservation of the weight of the package, and therefore that practice is not held within the purview of the pure-food law.

If Congress wishes to take this action and impose this added burden upon the consuming public, well and good. I wish it distinctly understood that I am not here speaking for the packers; I am speaking for the consumers of meat who already have to pay such enormous prices for hams and bacon.

It is not only the cost of 4 cents a ham that will be added, but if there is marked upon a ham its weight at the time it is cured and covered, say 12 pounds, all the courts and the Agricultural Department recognize the fact that this implies that the weight shall remain the same, although the ham may shrink from 4 ounces to 16 ounces. If that ham is marked upon the cover as weighing 12 pounds, and the retailer buys it from the packer or the wholesaler, he buys it at the actual weight; but when he comes to sell it, if it is branded as a 12-pound ham, he is going to sell it, more than likely, as a 12-pound ham, whether it weighs 11 pounds 4 ounces, 11 pounds 8 ounces, or only 11 pounds, and the consumer will have to pay for the 12 pounds. As it is now, if the packer puts up hams, and they remain in his possession two weeks, or one month, or two months, whatever shrinkage may occur the packer loses, because he sells them to the wholesaler at actual weight. If the wholesaler holds the ham a month, and it shrinks 4 ounces or 8 ounces, the retailer pays for the ham at its weight at the time he buys it from the wholesaler; and to-day when the retailer sells it he sells it at whatever the weight is when the ham is sold, and the retailer has to absorb whatever the shrinkage is.

So far as the wrappers are concerned, the cost of wrapping the ham and the preparation of it for market are taken into account to-day, as everybody knows. If the Congress wishes to impose the additional labor of marking the weight upon the ham at the time it is put up, well and good; but I wish the Senate to know that it will mean additional millions of dollars to the consumers of these articles.

The Senator from North Dakota tells me that he desires the passage of this bill to-night. I do not wish to say anything more about the subject at this time. I have given a plain statement of facts; and I predict now, Mr. President, if this provision becomes a law, the consuming public will pay millions of dollars which otherwise they would not pay. On that statement, I simply ask for a vote upon the amendment before the bill passes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I very much wish to accommodate the Senator from North Dakota in regard to having a vote taken upon the bill to-night, and that can be done, as far as I am concerned.

The Senator from Utah has called attention to the fact that this provision will not decrease the cost of living, but on the contrary it will increase it by somewhere from five to seven million dollars. That is literally true. With 150,000,000 pieces of side bacon and hams, which constitute the total output of the packing industry, large and small, in the country, this will require the separate weighing and handling of that 150,000,000 packages. The last business year there were that many pieces handled by the entire packing industry in the United States. Not only will this additional cost be put upon the consumer but it will furnish to the retail people a very convenient process for exacting from the purchaser, the ultimate consumer, an additional charge.

Let me give an illustration.

There are certain proprietary medicines or compounds that are in common use—antiseptics, deodorizers, milk of magnesia, and so forth. Magnesia in the common form in which it was used in the household years ago used to be in the form of a brick, or a solid mass, or something similar to cream cheese. Of late years it has been reduced to a milk of magnesia, and sold, one very well-known brand which is the common specific for superacidity, at 50 cents a bottle. When there was a revenue charge imposed in the internal-revenue act, in order to raise more money, of 2 cents on the 50-cent bottle, we would naturally suppose that it would be sold at 52 cents; but the very thrifty druggists in most parts of the country, or in many parts of the country, immediately not only added the 2 cents but they added an additional nickel for pasting on the revenue stamp. It took that much additional help. So the bottle, immediately following that, cost 57 cents instead of 50 cents.

In this particular instance, the average small ham weighs something like 12 pounds. It is now wrapped in paper or cloth, unweighed, and goes from the packer into the hands of the meat-market man or the grocer. The grocer sells it to the consumer in an entire ham by actual weight. It is put upon the

scales and weighed, and I pay him by the pound so much for smoked ham, so much for salted side meat or bacon. In every instance I pay by the pound by actual weight in the grocery shop. I do not pay for a pound more than I receive in the actual consumable commodity. Now, the whole 150,000,000 pieces not only will go through the process mentioned by the Senator from Utah but it will go to the retail dealer, the grocer, or the meat-market man with the weight stamped upon it. It will be a 12-pound piece of smoked ham, to illustrate. Smoked ham, from the time it leaves the hands of the packer, through the various stages of commercial activity until it reaches the kitchen, is subject to diminution in weight exceeding any known commodity of ordinary use in the kitchen, with the exception of sugar. Sugar has a very large moisture content, and it is subject to a most remarkable shrinkage, and that must be covered in the retail trade. Ham and bacon shrink very appreciably. Ham will shrink more than salted bacon. That is shrunk in the salting process, so that it is not so noticeable. But a 12-pound ham, to illustrate, is weighed, and stamped by the packer "12 pounds." It passes through the various hands, until when I buy it at retail it is marked "12 pounds." Now, whatever the retail grocer may pay for it, whether on a 12-pound basis or on the basis of its shrinkage, paying for it by actual pounds, I do not know what he will do, but I know the excuse that is made. It will be marked "12 pounds in weight," and the grocer will sell it to me for 12 pounds. It will be like other package commodities. Every package commodity is sold at the marked contents, branded on the outside of the package. Whether there is that much in it or not, nobody knows. A package of rice never contains the amount that is branded on the outside of the package. Not a single cereal package of any kind contains the amount that is supposed to be in it, or the amount that is branded on the outside, the quantity that is so branded, either in weight or measure, whatever it may be.

This gives to the retail dealer an excuse and a very plausible pretext for selling to me a 12-pound ham after the shrinkage is taken out. The shrinkage is gone. It is not a weight. I pay for it, and never get it. I pay on a 12-pound basis and get 11 pounds, or 10 pounds and a half. At least, I get short my 16 ounces to the pound, because it is estimated by actual observation that an average 12-pound ham will shrink from 10 to 14 ounces in passing from the packing house until it reaches the grocer, and by the time it reaches my kitchen it will have shrunk at least that much.

Now, I very much question whether the dealer sells his ham, branded on the outside "12 pounds" under Government inspection and by such an amendment as this, for what it actually contains. I will pay for it on the 12-pound basis, but I will doubt very much whether I will get the 12 pounds. I will get the 12 pounds less the shrinkage, but I will pay for it on the 12-pound basis. That happens every time these changes are made.

I could go further, but I do not wish to take the time of the Senate, because I think this bill ought to be passed to-night, for the reasons stated by the chairman of the committee. In every one of these cases—and I have followed them up for the last five years in groceries, in drug stores, in notion stores, in dry goods, in clothing, in everything that is sold by the piece or brand or trade-mark, whatever it may be—if it is sold by measure or weight, in every instance these changes are made the pretext for piling on the consumer additional retail charges. I have watched the steps by which, gradually, these small items have been added; and it is the most surprising thing in the retail trade to take some article of package food—prepared food, manufactured—and watch the gradual process of adding charges; or to take some well-established proprietary compound like I mentioned and watch its gradual increase from the old price before the war, adding on with each revenue charge an additional charge by the retail dealer, so that not only is the internal-revenue charge covered but an additional charge made the excuse for taking from the consumer an added 5 cents on the package or bottle. This is another excuse; and I have no doubt whatever that it will inure finally to the burden of the ultimate consumer who comes to buy the meat.

I will not engage in discussing the matters discussed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. At the proper time, Mr. President, I wish to go into those matters. Some of the large packers are constituents of mine, and I believe they have a right to be heard here. I think I ought to present some such matters as would at least fairly give some of the views that would make a hearing on both sides of this subject. I shall not do so now, because in proper time we will be before the Senate on the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Iowa, but at that time I shall go into the matter.

I think there is very much that the Senator from Iowa has said that is based upon misinformation; there is much of it that is based upon prejudice; and there is still more of it that is based upon ignorance. If the amount of merchandise handled by the National Wholesale Grocers' Association alone were considered—four billion dollars' worth of it every year, four billion dollars' worth of merchandise handled by this occupation alone, and there are 4,000 of them—if they charged the same rate of profit that the packers get out of their business, both large and small, whether it is Mr. Kingan, that firm over in Des Moines, Iowa, a small packer, but nevertheless a good one—if the National Wholesale Grocers, and they comprise practically all of them, would take for their profit what the packers, large and small, take for their profit, and the reduction were carried along to the retail grocer, and by him carried along again to the consumer on the sales he makes, there would be such a drop in the actual cost of living as to be matter of surprise to every consumer in the country.

When that bill is reached, Mr. President, I shall wish to take it up at some length; but I yield now for the passage of the appropriation bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am a good deal surprised at the statement that has been made to the effect that it will cost 4 cents to brand or stamp each piece of meat. Of course, I have no expert knowledge on that subject, but it strikes me that there will be a pretty large per cent of profit in it. I know that some of the ways of dealers are dark and devious, and I know that from my own State came a number of inspectors, when this legislation was pending, and insisted upon this amendment in the form that it now is, and at least one of them detailed to me the large amount of loss to the consumer by having the consumer pay for all of this moist and bloody paper, and so forth, that is used in wrapping up this meat.

It may be that if we pass this bill in its present form, some other means of skinning the public will be devised; but the argument which has just been made, when reduced to its final analysis, means this, that if certain prominent firms of the country that put up this meat can not be permitted to skin the public in one way, another way will be devised whereby they will do it. That is the logic of the situation. We can camouflage it as we please, but that is the fact.

I am willing to vote to retain this provision in the bill as it now is; and if that does not meet the situation, then I am ready to adopt some further legislation, such as experience may seem to approve.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, just a word. As I introduced this amendment in the committee, I want to say just a word against its assassination at this time by the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Illinois.

It developed at the hearings that a very large fee was paid by the packers to have the former solicitor of the Department of Agriculture come down and get this ruling out of the Agricultural Department. Now, the proposition is rather a simple one, I believe. It may work out badly, as these two Senators have suggested. Probably the price will be put up instead of being put down. That is probably so, no matter what we do; but, now, what is this proposition?

There are about 45,000,000 wrapped hams and pieces of bacon that receive Government inspection yearly. The average weight of the wrappings of each of these packages is 6 ounces, or three-eighths of a pound. With the paper costing 8 cents a pound, the wrapping of each of these packages costs the packer 3 cents. When they sell it, and sell this paper at bacon prices and ham prices, as they have been doing and can do under this ruling, the average selling price for the paper at the price per pound of the meat in it is 16 cents, or a gain of practically 13 cents a package.

Now, take the figures:

The cost to the packers of the paper for 45,000,000 packages at 3 cents is \$1,350,000.

The packers' selling price of the same paper at 16 cents is \$7,200,000.

Or a gross gain to the packers of \$5,850,000.

From that deduct wrapping expense, freight, and overhead, about \$450,000, leaving a net gain of \$5,400,000. That is about 400 per cent on the paper, and that is passed on to the consumer.

Now, this may be passed on to the consumer. I suppose it will be; but we have not tried the plan that is now proposed under this amendment, and we might try it.

Then, on the pork-loin paper, in which the pork loins are wrapped, there will be another profit of something like a million dollars.

All those who believe in paying bacon prices and ham prices for the paper and string around their bundles ought to vote for the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply want to say, in answer to the Senator, that I hardly think it is fair to say that the former solicitor of the Department of Agriculture came down here and got that ruling. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Supreme Courts of Washington, Minnesota, and Nebraska have held the same way. There have been numerous decisions in the lower courts, and the attorney generals of California, Montana, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia gave opinions to the same effect; and when the decision of the department was appealed to the Attorney General, Mr. Gregory, he upheld the decision of the department.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. Perhaps it ought not to be stated in that way. He was employed as counsel, and his services were so eminently satisfactory to the packers that in the correspondence, which was before the committee, it appeared that they increased the fee that they had proposed to give him because of his very successful work.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, he only took the position that most of the courts of the United States—all of them where the question has been brought before them—have taken.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say in relation to the selling of strings and paper on hams that the Senator knows very well that whatever wrappings are put upon any article, I do not care whether it is rice or whether it is a patent medicine or whether it is woolen goods or what not, whenever the article itself is put either in a can or a paper box or wrapped in paper and tied with strings, they are all taken into account in the cost of the production of the articles themselves. So it is with ham; so it is with bacon. It is a straight business proposition; and all the appealing in the world to the prejudices against the packers will never change the business principles.

I want to say further, Mr. President, I know that if this provision becomes a law the consuming public in this country will pay more than it has paid in the past.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator from Utah that the representative of one of the packers appeared before the committee, and was allowed to make his statement with reference to this provision in the bill, and the committee considered the matter very thoroughly. I think I might state that the committee were practically unanimous in reporting out the bill with this provision in it. Now, at this time, after the bill has passed both Houses three times—it is the third time, now, that the House has passed practically the same bill—why should we at this time strike out any of these provisions which have been agreed to when we have been in conference for weeks? I ask the Senator from Utah that question.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will answer that by saying that it makes no difference when legislation is disagreed to, either in the House or in the Senate, if it is bad; and I say that this legislation is bad.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator believe that the committee of conference will agree to striking this out?

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say; but that is not for us to decide. That is for the conferees to decide. I want to say, Mr. President, that it is our duty to do what we think is right; and it is the Senate's duty, if they think this is going to throw a burden upon the consumers of the United States, to strike it out, and then if the conferees do not agree, that is another question.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not want to engage in any controversy with the Senator from Utah as to the probability of the packers increasing their price to the consumer. Mr. McCabe did state that it would cost \$4,500,000 a year to do this work; but if you figure out what it costs the consumer for wrapping paper, and not only wrapping paper and string but many other things which are wrapped up with meats, you will find that on a small piece of meat, 5 or 6 pounds, the wrapper weighs at least a half pound. At the rate of 40 cents, and in some cases 60 cents, a pound, that means at least half a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that I do not want to repeat my argument upon this question. I know that there are about 6 ounces of paper and string around a 12-pound ham. Everybody knows it; but it is taken into account in the cost of the article, and the cost of the article regulates the price at which it is sold. It is just the same as if I had a bolt of cloth, and I put a paper wrapper around it, and fastened

the wrapper with twine, and I had the yardage marked upon it. Every particle of labor and all the material used is figured in the cost per yard of the bolt of cloth which is so wrapped.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe I am safe in making the statement that the public is willing to pay for this work.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah one question.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says—and I think he says very correctly—that in all goods that are sold in packages or in containers the cost of the package or the cost of the container is added to the cost of the article. That, however, does not answer the statement made by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. SMOOT. No; Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Iowa says that in the case of hams and bacon the price at which the paper in which they were wrapped was sold was 300 per cent more than the cost of the paper.

Mr. KENYON. Four hundred per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, is that true? If that statement is true, the Senator has not answered the argument at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not think it was necessary, because the Senator knows that, for instance, the lacquered boxes in which tea is put up cost a great many times more than all the tea that is in them, and if he will permit—

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator does not mean to say that in adding that to the cost of the tea they do not add more than the cost of the container. The point of the Senator from Iowa is that in this case they add three or four hundred per cent more than the cost.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator loses sight of the fact that the cost of whatever paper or string used in wrapping the ham becomes a part of the cost of the ham itself; and whatever the cost is, that is the basis of the price it is sold for. It makes no difference, then, as to what it weighs. Even if the paper were a greater part of the weight of the ham, it would be taken into consideration as to the cost of the meat itself. The Senator knows it, and everybody else knows it; and it is the same with everything that is put up wrapped in paper. Whether you wear it or whether you eat it makes no difference. It is a part of the cost of the article that is wrapped, and so it is with the ham.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if the position of the Senator from Utah is correct, then it must follow that the packers would be tempted to put 10 pounds of paper around an 8-pound ham.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. POMERENE. And that kind of a temptation ought not to be placed before them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is perfectly ridiculous. That shows just exactly the mind of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course it is ridiculous, but it is the only legitimate conclusion that one can reach from the Senator's logic.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will just bear with me a moment, I will conclude. I want to say, Mr. President, that there is no need of discussing a question of this kind with a Senator who would make such a statement. It is building up a straw man and then throwing dough at him. There is nothing to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot].

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time. The bill was read the third time and passed.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it was my good fortune this morning to read an article appearing in the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of July 14, entitled "An unanswerable argument," referring to the President's statement that a league of nations for the purpose of continuing to enforce the terms of the treaty of peace is absolutely necessary and inseparable from the treaty itself. I do not want to take up the time of the Senate by reading it. I ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to object. I am not going to object to these requests until the Senate itself wants to do it. I think the proper thing to do, every day that the Senator from Mississippi comes into this Chamber and puts in the RECORD a long string of editorials and opinions from Tom, Dick, and Harry, is that somebody ought to put in something on the other side to assist—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not yielded the floor yet.

Mr. SMOOT. I presume the Senator wants to ask for more insertion, and I am not going to object if he desires to put others in; but I want to say this to the Senate, the other day it cost the Government over \$1,000 for editorials and stuff that were put into the RECORD by one Senator—

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was not this Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. And I do not believe it is worth it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator. I submit that request.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator already had submitted it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AN UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT.

When President Wilson informed the Senate that it would be impossible to establish permanent peace without making provision for a continuing cooperative alliance to enforce the terms of the treaty he advanced an argument in support of a league of nations that is unanswerable. There are so many continuing contracts, obligations, bargains, and agreements that a continuing association with the duty of seeing that they are carried out is indispensable. Otherwise, who should determine whether the obligations had been met, the bargains kept, the contracts fulfilled in the years to come?

If there were no other argument for a league of nations, this one presentation of imperative needs would be conclusive.

Germany signed the peace treaty under protest. She would break it to-morrow if she dared. To Germany the one supreme law is force; her people will obey no other. If she were left to face France alone, she would probably go to war to-morrow to retain the Saar Basin. She would take chances against any single one of her late antagonists before she would make the necessary territorial renunciations to reconstitute ancient Poland.

Treaties mean nothing when dealing with such peoples unless there is a compelling force behind them. Any breaking of the alliance that triumphed over German despotism would be a signal for loosing anew the barbarian hordes beyond the Rhine. There are millions of them left, and the peace which they signed through compulsion has not made of them different beings from what they were in 1918.

There is no gainsaying that a league of free nations is a practical necessity. If such a league were not formed, the association of powers that broke the German military machine would have been dissolved when the treaty was signed. What, then, about the German reparations made to continue over a series of years? What prospect would there be for Belgium to enforce her treaty rights against Germany if there were not the same association of powers back of her that made Germany admit those rights? How could mandatory powers be entrusted to certain nations if there were no association of nations to see that those powers were not abused? Who would decide whether Germany was keeping her treaty obligations? Many of the settlements attempted by the conference are admitted by the commissioners to be experimental. If they do not work well, the league of nations provides the machinery to make the necessary revisions.

To dissolve the peace conference without providing an association of powers to enforce the decrees of the peace treaty would be to leave the world in a state of anarchy. The thought of such a thing is inconceivable. The President never spoke truer words than when he said:

That there should be a league of nations to steady the counsels and maintain the peaceful understanding of the world, to make not treaties alone, but the accepted principles of international law as well, the actual rule of conduct among the Governments of the world had been one of the agreements accepted from the first as the basis of peace with the Central Powers.

That the affairs of the world have reached a condition where international cooperation is necessary to avoid anarchy is indisputable. If the peace conference were to adjourn sine die without forming a continuing association of powers to act in concert on international questions it would have to reassemble within six months. And Senators who are so mentally blind as not to recognize this self-evident truth are sorry representatives of a great people.

One has but to peruse the covenant of the league of nations to discover that the association so formed is inevitable. The most cogent criticism to be aimed at the covenant is that the bonds which unite the nations are too loose, not too binding. To what does America pledge itself in joining the league? Simply that she will assist, for the present at least, in enforcing the terms of the peace treaty. It is not an indissoluble association, such as is formed by the American Constitution. Any nation can withdraw by giving two years' notice of her intention so to do. It does not, and could not, compel this country to take part in any European war if our people were not so minded; for the Constitution of our country places the declaration of war in the hands of Congress, and one Congress can not bind its successor to any course of action. President Wilson reminded the Senate that this condition was discussed at length in the peace conference.

President Wilson is said to have told Senators in the anteroom of the Senate Chamber that the American commissioners were disappointed in the Shantung provision, and that they would have preferred to name at once the amount of money reparation Germany would be required to make. But it must be remembered that the peace conference had been in session for six months and that the nerves of the people of the world were getting on edge. A treaty was necessary. If wholly satisfactory settlements could not be agreed upon in the midst of the confusion and the passions of Europe, the single alternative was to form a tribunal that could reconsider and revise some of the decrees after order had been restored among the nations. To insist upon everything at this time was to get nothing. Practical solutions were obligatory.

To attempt to disassociate the league of nations from the peace treaty would be to nullify the treaty in its enactment. If the league were not formed from choice it would have to be established from necessity. The men who continue in the opposition are simply impossible as national representatives.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a short article by Henry W. Williams, the great historian and publicist, in answer to Mr. Root's suggestions, showing that they are perfectly mischievous. I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Extract from "The Evening Sun" Tuesday, July 1, 1919.]

MR. ROOT'S SUGGESTIONS ARE MISCHIEVOUS.

(By Henry W. Williams.)

As the Senate appears to have fallen back on the suggestions of Mr. Root, it would seem to be well to consider the situation which will result if such suggestions be followed. Mr. Root in his letter to Senator Lodge recommends that the Senate should act upon the treaty of peace as follows:

"The Senate of the United States advises and consents to the ratification of the said treaty with the following reservations and understandings to be made a part of the instrument of ratification."

And then suggests three reservations or amendments:

1. That the tenth article of the covenant for the league of nations should be excluded from the treaty.

2. That article 1 of the covenant for the league of nations should be amended so as to modify the terms of withdrawal from the league.

3. In effect, that a new clause should be added to the covenant for the league of nations setting forth:

"That nothing therein contained shall be construed to imply relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions, or to require the submission of its policy regarding questions which it deems to be purely American questions to the decision or recommendations of other powers (whatever this may mean)."

The powers of the Senate of the United States with reference to treaties are well set forth by Mr. Justice Brown in his concurring opinion in "The Diamond Rings," 183 U. S., 182. Referring to the resolution of the Senate purporting to construe the treaty between Spain and the United States, made upon the conclusion of the Spanish-American War, Mr. Justice Brown says:

"To be efficacious such resolution must be considered either (1) as an amendment to the treaty, or (2) as a legislative act qualifying or modifying the treaty. It is neither.

"It can not be regarded as part of the treaty, since it received neither the approval of the President nor the consent of the other contracting power.

"A treaty in its legal sense is defined by Bouvier as a 'compact between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare' (2 Law Dict., 1136), and by Webster as 'an agreement, league or contract between two or more nations or sovereigns, formally signed by commissioners properly authorized, and solemnly ratified by the several sovereigns or the supreme power of each State.'

"In its essence it is a contract. It differs from an ordinary contract only in being an agreement between independent States instead of private parties. Foster v. Neilson, 2 Pet. 253, 314, 7 L. ed., 415, 435; Head Money Cases, 112 U. S., 580, sub nom. Edye v. Robertson, 28 L. ed., 798, 5 Sup. Ct. Rep., 247. By the Constitution (Art. 2, par. 2), the President 'shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

"Obviously the treaty must contain the whole contract between the parties, and the power of the Senate is limited to a ratification of such terms as have already been agreed upon between the President, acting for the United States, and the commissioners of the other contracting power.

"The Senate has no right to ratify the treaty and introduce new terms into it which shall be obligatory upon the other power, although it may refuse its ratification, or make such ratification conditional upon the adoption of amendments to the treaty. If, for instance, the treaty with Spain had contained a provision insulating the inhabitants of the Philippines as citizens of the United States, the Senate might have refused to ratify it until this provision was stricken out. But it could not, in my opinion, ratify the treaty and then adopt a resolution declaring it not to be its intention to admit the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands to the privileges of citizenship of the United States. Such resolution would be inoperative as an amendment to the treaty, since it had not received the assent of the President or the Spanish commissioners."

Mr. Justice Brown proceeds further to point out that such resolution can not be considered a legislative act modifying the treaty, because it never was passed by the House of Representatives or received the signature of the President.

It has also been determined by Chief Justice Taney in the case of Doe v. Braden (16 How., 636) that treaties can be amended by stipulations included in the ratification thereof by the parties thereto; but in that case, as Chief Justice Taney points out, such stipulation was formally written in by Spain and the treaty again ratified with the stipulation in it by the Senate of the United States and the President.

If, therefore, the suggestions of Mr. Root should be adopted and the reservations and understandings suggested by him should be made a part of the instrument of ratification, they would become a part of the treaty, provided the treaty as thereby amended was ratified by the other parties thereto. Failing such ratification, however, by the other parties thereto the ratification by the Senate would never take effect, the result being the same as if the Senate had rejected the treaty.

Mr. Root, apparently realizing that the law might be as above stated, suggests that the consent of the four great powers, to wit, Great Britain, France, Japan, and Italy, should be obtained. For various reasons, however, they might refuse to concur—France, possibly, on the ground that the first amendment weakened its protection against Germany; Japan, to obtain further concessions on its own behalf; Italy, to reopen the Fiume question. And it might well be that even if the four great powers did concur, objection might be raised by some of the South American Republics to the third reservation or amendment.

But, more important than all, under the law laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States the treaty could not take effect as to the United States until the proposed amendments had been concurred in by Germany, and what reason is there to believe that Germany would concur? Its interests would apparently lie to the contrary. By non-concurring it would either compel the United States to withdraw from the league of nations altogether and to establish a separate negotiated and not dictated peace, or it would force upon the United States the humiliation of withdrawing its proposals.

By the time these amendments were proposed the treaty would probably have been ratified by Germany and three of the great powers, and by its terms would have taken effect, and Germany could not be compelled to concur.

The adoption of Mr. Root's suggestions, therefore, would apparently put the United States in a false and humiliating position, with the ultimate result that it would either have to recede from its proposed amendments or reject the treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand certain resolutions of certain citizens of the State of Maryland in favor of the adoption of the league of nations, and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Resolutions passed at conference of Maryland Branch League to Enforce Peace, Belvedere Hotel, Baltimore, Md., July 16, 1919.

Whereas the treaty of peace with Germany is before the Senate of the United States, and the welfare of the United States and the world requires that this treaty be ratified; and

Whereas said treaty has been ratified by Germany and when ratified by three of the great powers will take effect, and thereupon can not be amended without the consent of all of the parties thereto; and

Whereas when said treaty has taken effect no party thereto has any legal right either to demand or enforce the consent of the other parties thereto to any amendment; and

Whereas it is believed that reservations incorporated in the instrument of ratification would constitute amendments, which would amount to a rejection of the treaty unless consented to by the other high contracting parties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Maryland Branch of the League to Enforce Peace respectfully requests the Senate of the United States to ratify this treaty without amendments and without reservations which are to be incorporated in the instrument of ratification.

Judge HENRY D. HARLAN, Chairman,
Judge WM. H. ADKINS, Easton, Md.,
Dr. THOMAS FELL, Annapolis, Md.,
Mr. RENO S. HARP, Frederick, Md.,
Judge OSCAR LESER, Baltimore, Md.,
Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand certain resolutions passed at a meeting held in commemoration of Mississippi's dead soldiers by certain citizens of Mississippi, asking the Senate to ratify the treaty of peace, together with the league of nations.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMEMORATIVE OF JAMES D. McDONALD—A PATRIOTIC STATEMENT BY ARMY BOYS.

A memorial service in honor of one of our Army boys took place in the largest church in Philadelphia, Miss. The people filled the auditorium, which was beautifully decorated by the women of the Red Cross with flowers, ferns, and United States flags. The singing was inspiring. The splendid address by Hon. J. M. Wadsworth and the excellent sermon by Rev. C. P. Thraill were very appropriate, forceful, and patriotic. At the close of the commemorative service three military men, two of whom had rendered service in France, came to the rostrum and submitted to the large audience the following statement, which was adopted unanimously, except one man:

"We, citizens of Philadelphia, Miss., and all others attending this memorial service held July 13, 1919, in loving memory of James D., son of Rev. and Mrs. J. F. McDonald, who was a volunteer member of the Expeditionary Forces in France, are glad to know that when the summons came, calling him to a higher life and service in the citizenship of heaven, he was at his post faithfully serving his country as postal clerk at Brest, France, and that he joyfully obeyed the summons. By his death he has won the highest and most significant decoration. That decoration is not a medal. Medals only adorn the uniform. The distinguished decoration which he has won is the wooden cross which stands above his grave in Lambelzelle Cemetery, 3 miles from Brest.

"Since Christ spoiled the powers of evil, triumphing over them in His cross, the cross is no longer a symbol of sorrow and shame, but of victory and triumph. Sixteen hundred white crosses adorn the graves of our American boys in Lambelzelle Cemetery. Each is a silent reminder that the World War was a stupendous contest between Bethlehem and Berlin, between Christ and the powers of evil, and the cause of righteousness has gained the victory.

"Autocracy has been hurled from its throne. The Old World order, which made it possible for a few men to plunge the nations of earth into war, has been overthrown. A new international world order to safeguard the world against anarchy and the recurrence of war is to be built up. The purpose of the league of nations covenant is to establish such an order, an order which shall make it impossible for a few men to thrust war upon the world, slaughter millions of men, outrage womanhood, crucify childhood, and martyr old age. Such an order is what we desire to get out of the war for the good of universal humanity and for the sake of all our Army boys, those who gave up their lives to vindicate the cause of an outraged humanity and a menaced liberty, and those who helped to vindicate the same cause and still survive. For such an international order we stand and will ever stand.

"(Signed) HOMER TURNER, Philadelphia, Miss.
HEKTON ARNETT, Philadelphia, Miss.
ROY SPIVEY, Philadelphia, Miss.

"Committee."

Mr. Turner was a sergeant, Medical Department.

Mr. Arnett was a first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Mr. Spivey was a corporal in the Infantry.

REV. J. F. McDONALD,
Minister in the Presbyterian Church
in the United States of America,
Philadelphia, Miss.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not objecting to that; but I hope that this outrageous practice will stop at some time or other. I have some regard, at least, for the Treasury of the United States. I may be wrong in it, Mr. President; it may be a waste of time; but I want to say that at some time or other the American people will demand that we insist upon the expenditure of public money in the proper way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought the Senator had.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, so that this will not be all one-sided, I have here an article by a professor of political science of Johns Hopkins University, Dr. W. W. Willoughby. It is upon the question of the Shantung robbery. I ask that this article be printed in the Record without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. Would it not be a good idea to stop this practice, and to compel the Senators to read all the articles they put in?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have thought many times of doing that. There were about a dozen Senators only yesterday discussing this question, and I said: "What is the use of it, unless the Senate will stand by me in it?" They said they would do it, and if I thought there was a majority of the Senators who would do it, no more articles would go into the Record unless Senators stood upon the floor and read them into the Record. I think that is what will have to come before the practice is stopped, but I do not want to do it until in the Senate there is a sentiment sufficient to justify it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the article submitted by the Senator from Utah will be inserted in the Record.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHINA, JAPAN, AND THE WESTERN POWERS—DEMOCRACY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION.

(By Thomas F. Millard. New York: The Century Co.)

This is a work with a single purpose—to point out the significance of the recent acts of Japan, especially with regard to China, and to indicate what should be the policies of the western powers in the light of these acts. It is not unlikely that most of its readers, without any special knowledge of conditions in the Far East, will close the volume with the impression that it is a piece of highly colored special pleading and that its recommendations are to be accordingly discounted. And yet the volume gives an accurate account of the part that Japan has played during the last few years in the Far East. The writer of this review has spent a good part of the last four years in the Orient and has made every possible effort to obtain a knowledge and understanding of the political situation there presented and has thus been able to check up most of Mr. Millard's statements, and has found them correct.

It is not too strong a statement to say that Japan's record with regard to China has been uniformly, since 1906, an oppressive and immoral one, glossed over by repeated assertions of friendliness, but controlled by the determination to demoralize China and thus provide an opportunity, as well as an excuse, to increase Japan's political influence and control in that country. Japan can point to no single act on her part that has been affirmatively and disinterestedly helpful to China. On the contrary, in South Manchuria and Shantung, where her control has been predominant, she has permitted extensive smuggling in fraud of the Chinese revenues and to the prejudice of fair competition with the other powers trading with China; she has allowed the importation and sale of morphia in large quantities, in many cases with the open aid of her consuls, from which large profits have accrued to herself and infinite injury to the Chinese people; she has exported from China, contrary to Chinese law, enormous quantities of copper "cash"; she is the one nation that has arbitrarily refused to allow the Chinese customs authorities to examine postal parcels sent into China from Japan through the post offices which she maintains in China; she alone, during the war, prevented China from taking steps similar to those taken by the other nations of the world to conserve her supply of silver; in the tariff-revision commission which was recently held at Shanghai to revalue goods for customs purposes it was her representatives who made it especially difficult to secure for China the effective 5 per cent ad valorem duties which under treaties she is entitled to levy; in many well-established cases in Shantung, through her control of the railways and railway zones, she checked the efforts of the Chinese authorities to suppress the brigandage that is prevalent in that Province; and through the importation of arms and munitions and the many loans which her bankers have made during the last three years she has knowingly made possible the continuance of the civil strife that has devastated so many of the Provinces and made impossible the institution of administrative and financial reforms in China. It is true that these loans have not been made directly by the Government of Japan, but in her own official reports she has described the manner in which she has given to her banks additional powers in order that they might negotiate and float these loans, and by the issue of belated restraining orders she has shown that there never was any lack of legal power to put an end to such deliberate financial debauchery of the Chinese politicians.

Earlier in the war Japan vetoed the proposition that China should come into the war upon the side of the Allies and, after her consent to this step was finally purchased and China had become a belligerent, she entered into agreements with the military leaders in China, whom she was able to control, whereby it was made practically impossible for China to take any military steps without her consent. These military conventions, the exact terms of which Japan insisted should be kept secret even from her own allies, provided for joint consultation and action on the part of the two countries upon the northern border of China, but, in fact, when action was finally taken China's voice played absolutely no part. Indeed, through her control of the South Manchurian railways, Japan prevented, in a very large measure, the transportation of those troops to the Siberian border which China was anxious to send. Of events in Siberia the reviewer has no personal knowledge, but all his information is to the effect that many acts of the Japanese officials there tended to keep alive the contests among the several factions and thus to render more difficult for the Allies the solution of the political and military problem. The contest between China,

Japan, and the Allies with regard to the status and operation of the Chinese Eastern Railway running through the north of Manchuria constitutes an interesting story in itself. Certain it is that, after coming to an understanding with the United States and the Allies as to the number of troops she was to send to Siberia, Japan at once passed ten times that number into that country and North Manchuria.

The whole record of Japan in Manchuria since 1906 has been one of continual violation of those sovereign rights of China which Japan has repeatedly undertaken to respect and a disregard of the substance, if not the letter, of the open-door doctrine.

In the forefront of Japan's offenses in China are her actions in Shantung. This part of the story is now becoming more or less known in the western world, but, in view of the provisions of the treaty of peace that bear upon this point, it is important that the essential facts should be again stated. From the beginning to end the Shantung story reflects discredit upon all the parties concerned, with the exception of China, which has at all times been the helpless victim. In 1898 Germany forced from China the lease of the Bay of Kiaochow and the surrounding territory, including the city of Tsingtau, together with valuable railway and mining rights in the Province, the only excuse for this act of aggression being the fact that two German Jesuit priests had been killed by bandits. Thus was inaugurated a series of demands on the part of the other powers for leases to spheres of interest in China which, by provoking a legitimate antiforeign feeling upon the part of the Chinese, did much to bring about the Boxer outbreak of 1900.

At the outbreak of the Great War in 1914 Japan at once entered as a belligerent, moved to this action, most of her statesmen have asserted, by her obligations under the Anglo-Japanese alliance. This obligation has, however, been denied by Ambassador Ishii. An ultimatum was sent to Germany to evacuate Kiaochow and to surrender possession to the Japanese, with a view to the eventual return of the territory to China. Official statements were made to the world by the Japanese that they had in view no territorial or other advantages that would be in derogation of the rights of the Chinese or of the western powers. From the beginning, however, it was evident that more than military considerations were to control. Japanese troops were landed on the coast of neutral China a hundred miles from Tsingtau and military occupation of the railways was pushed westward to Tsinanfu, the capital of the Province, more than 250 miles distant from the ostensible object of the military expedition. Not content with military occupation extending to the very heart of this great Province, which in size and population practically equals Great Britain, the Japanese openly disregarded the territorial sovereignty of China and instituted civil governments at various points along the railway line, and even at Tsinanfu itself.

In the spring of 1915 came, like a bolt out of the blue, the 21 demands presented by Japan to China, one group of which related to Shantung. There is not space here to review the scope of these demands, but certain of their general characteristics and of the circumstances attending their presentation can not be too often emphasized.

1. In the first place the demands were presented directly to Yuan Shih-kai, the President of the Republic, and not through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as ordinary diplomatic usage would have required. Yuan was told that he must not divulge the fact that demands had been presented to him, and he was given to understand that if he acceded to them he might be assured of Japanese aid in the promotion of his own ambitions, but that if he did not accede the Japanese Government would not hold itself responsible for acts that might be taken against him by disaffected parties who, as he knew, were to be found in both China and Japan.

2. These demands, if they had been fully granted by China, would have made of China virtually a dependency of Japan, and have been in flagrant violation of the treaty rights of other powers in China. Especially was this true of the now famous "fifth group," into which the demands of a general and comprehensive character were gathered. So strong in the end became foreign pressure that Japan consented, not to abandon, but to postpone this fifth group of demands for future discussion—a status which they still retain.

3. The 21 demands were, for the most part, not in settlement of previously pending controversies between China and Japan, and they were not advanced on the ground that Japan had suffered wrongs from China for which compensation was due; nor were there any treaty or other promises obligating China to surrender the important rights that were demanded. The only justification put forward at the time by Japan was that the arrangement proposed would promote peace and good will between the two countries. In short, the demands were nothing more than a list of Japan's wants presented at a time when China was helpless and the other treaty powers not in a position effectively to object.

4. When, notwithstanding the injunction of secrecy, it became rumored that certain demands upon China had been made by Japan, the Japanese diplomatic officials denied the fact. When it became no longer possible to maintain this mendacious denial, the Japanese Government officially supplied the other treaty powers with what purported to be a list of the demands—a list which it presently appeared omitted some of the most important and drastic features.

5. Finally, Japan, after somewhat revising her demands and postponing, as has been said, the fifth group for future discussion, issued an ultimatum, couched in the most unequivocal terms, and at the same time took steps to strengthen her military forces in China. "It is hereby declared," the ultimatum ran, "that if no satisfactory reply is received before or at the specified time, the Imperial Government will take such steps as they may deem necessary." China was thus given no option; she had to yield; and, as a result, treaties were drawn up and signed embodying the demands that had been made. And it is upon these treaties that Japan has chiefly relied before the Paris peace conference in support of her claims to rights in the Province of Shantung.

Under one of these treaties the Chinese Government agreed "to give full assent to all matters upon which the Japanese Government may hereafter agree with the German Government relating to the disposition of all rights, interests, and concessions which Germany, by virtue of treaties or otherwise, possesses in relation to the Province of Shantung." In an accompanying exchange of notes the Japanese ambassador to China promised in the name of his Government that the leased territory of Kiaochow would be restored to China, but only upon the conditions that the whole of Kiaochow Bay should be opened as a commercial port; that there should be "a concession under the exclusive jurisdiction of Japan, to be established at a place designated by the Japanese Government," and that there should be also an "international concession" if the other powers should so desire. In anticipation of the second of the conditions the Japanese have already marked out for themselves an area in the city of Tsingtau which includes the entire

water front suitable for commercial purposes and the railway approaches and the site of the railway station. Thus, if the time comes when Tsingtau is handed back to China, it will be only the empty shell that will be returned. The former German railway and mining rights in Shantung are to remain permanently in Japanese possession, and, as regards those rights, it is to be observed that already Japan has claimed and is exercising under them privileges which Germany some time before the war had formally returned to China. In addition to the rights claimed under the treaties of 1915, Japan has since obtained additional special privileges in Shantung under secret agreements with certain of the Chinese officials.

One more important fact has to be mentioned before we come to the action upon the Shantung situation taken by the powers at Paris. It now transpires, according to secret documents that have been published, that in 1917, when, at the instance of the United States, China was again urged to enter the war upon the side of the Allies, Japan, as a condition precedent to giving her consent to the proposal, required of Russia, France, Great Britain, and Italy that they should promise that, at the end of the war, they would support Japan's claims to the German rights in Shantung as well as to possession of the German islands in the Pacific and north of the Equator, a promise which these powers then gave.

On the face of the diplomatic correspondence that has been published the consideration moving the powers to make this promise was, as has been said, that Japan should give her assent to China's coming into the war; but it is a strain upon one's intelligence to be asked to believe that the powers expected to receive from China's entrance aid sufficient in amount, not only to balance the considerable concessions which they themselves had to make to China but to compensate for sanctioning the lodgment of Japan in Shantung and the possession by her of the Pacific Islands, which would inevitably be strongly objected to by the Australians. Furthermore, Japan had not herself made such sacrifices in the war as to merit substantial payments. Indeed, from the standpoint of trade, shipping, and industry she had profited enormously by the war. One can, therefore, only speculate as to the existence upon the part of the Allies of a feeling in 1917 that they would be well advised to keep Japan as well satisfied as possible—a feeling which may conceivably have played a part in inducing the United States to consent, in the Ishihara-Lansing notes, to recognize the "special interests" of Japan in China.

After all, however, the most reprehensible feature of the promises exacted and made in 1917 remains to be pointed out. At the very time that the Allies were inviting China to enter the war as their coally and pointing out to her the advantages of so doing, they were secretly agreeing among themselves to reward one of their number with spoils to be taken from China. It is impossible to imagine an act of worse faith than this, and that the statesmen of the European allied powers should have been induced to be guilty of it gives further weight to the argument that there was some reason, which it has not been deemed wise to avow, why, at the time, it was deemed imperative that Japan's wishes should be met. The United States, too, was not fairly treated, having been kept in ignorance of the fact that these engagements had been entered into.

Here in outline is the Shantung situation, with injustice, deceit, brutal force, and unfair dealing characterizing every step of its development, and yet upon it has been set the seal of approval or at least of confirmation by the powers at Paris. It is understandable that Great Britain, France, and Italy should have felt themselves bound by their promises of 1917, but why should the United States have consented to a proposition which was in flagrant contradiction of the fundamental principles of political justice and right which, through President Wilson, had been so emphatically declared? Why should America have been willing to violate the rights of a great and friendly people struggling to maintain democratic institutions for the benefit of a people whose political philosophy and practices have been strikingly similar to those of that damnable country.

The treaty of peace thus leaves politics in the Far East in a very unsatisfactory situation. It is to be hoped that the league of nations will prove an instrumentality by means of which a better condition of affairs may be secured.

W. W. WILLOUGHBY.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to say something in reply to the Senator from Utah, but I do not want to take up much time of the Senate at this hour.

The object of the discussion of great questions before this body is twofold. It is partially to inform Members of the Senate themselves and partially to inform the opinion of the country. If things are said outside of this body that are philosophically more sound, logically more accurate, and really more eloquent than things which are said upon the floor, then it is just as right to send them out to the people as to send out what is said upon the floor. In fact, the body at the other end of the Capitol has a good practice which it would be well for the Senate to adopt. Over there when a man gets ready to read a long written speech he asks permission to print, and it is printed, and he does not stand there and read his own manuscript to the House.

For the same reason, when I see something that is an absolute clinching argument upon some phase or another of this great question, it would be a waste of time to force me or anyone else to read it when it can reach the people whom I wish it to reach just as well by being inserted in the RECORD, and having been inserted in the RECORD it can reach the people by being copied by the newspapers throughout the country.

The object of our existence here is not simply to listen to one another talk. We are part of the American parliament, it is true, whose business it is to parley or talk, but we talk for the purpose of informing the human intellect and for the purpose of persuading the human will; and a man like Henry W. Williams can say things so much better than the Senator from Utah or I either one can say them, and in a much shorter form, that I can reach the object of informing the human

judgment and persuading the human will much more quickly and at much less expense to the public than by standing here an hour or so upon my feet and saying in an inferior way what he has said in a superior way and in a more concise way, and can therefore get it before the people in a proper way.

One of these things I inserted was from a paper which, I think, if I am not mistaken, is a Republican paper; but it is a magnificent editorial; it excels anything as an argument that I have heard in this body, with the possible exception of the first argument made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX].

Every time we want to inform popular opinion upon this subject the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] jumps to his feet, and thinks he is funny because the things we put in the RECORD to go to the American intellect are not the words of Senators. Yesterday a Senator informed me that he thanked God he was original, and whenever anything went from him into the RECORD it came out of his own mind. I am of the opinion that there are many things that do not come out of my own mind or from the tip of my own tongue that are superior to a great many things that have come from the tip of my own tongue.

I say the Senate had better go to the other extreme and do as the House does, and when a man gets up with not a speech to make but a long document to read, if he desires to print it, let him print it, and it will save the time of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in this connection I want to say that I do not think that little doggerel the Senator put in the RECORD the other day, entitled "Now I lay me down to sleep"—

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was read.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator put it in all the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not think that was worth inserting. I thought I had better read it.

Mr. SMOOT. Somebody else's remarks that sprang from some man's mind that had an intellect oh! so much greater than the Senators of the United States. I read it over this morning to be sure to see whether I understood it correctly or not. I also wanted to see if the Senator really let it be printed in the RECORD. It is preserved in the RECORD, but I do not think it is a credit to the Senator or the author.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not expect that delicate piece of irony and humor to be appreciated by my friend, the Senator from Utah, who, whatever may be his merits, has thus far not earned any reputation as an appreciator of delicate humor.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I never intend to be, if the Senator calls that rubbish delicate humor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. His abilities lie in another direction. He is hard working and has sound judgment, but I think he is a little like Samuel Johnson said about a Scotchman, that, as a rule, if you want to get a joke into a Scotchman's head your only safe and reliable way of doing it would be to split his head open with a hatchet and insert it bodily. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. I want to remain that way, Mr. President.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD four editorials from the National Republican. They are written by George B. Lockwood. I consider him one of the best editorial writers on political subjects in the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The editorials referred to are as follows:

LET THE WORLD CONSTITUTION BE CONSTITUTIONALLY WRITTEN.

"This paper protests again against the thoroughly undemocratic and unrepresentative methods employed to put over on the people of this country a world constitution and a world parliament. These objections apply with equal force whether the constitution proposed be the mere beginning of a superstate or whether it be the fully panoplied world autocracy outlined in the Cecil-Wilson covenant, with legislative, executive, and judicial powers combined in one world parliament, in which this country was to have but a feeble minority voice.

"The suspicion persists that there is an Ethiopian in the woodpile in any hand-me-down, made-in-Europe plan for a league of nations in which the American people are not given the right of original suggestion, which represents in the making the usurpation of legislative powers by the executive branch of this and other governments without giving to the people of this country, supposed to be a representative republic, any voice whatever in framing a world constitution, the most important document ever presented for their consideration.

"The people of this country have been accustomed to bearing a hand in the framing of the laws which bind them. Their Constitution was not handed down to them from on high; it was written by the representatives of the States duly chosen for

that particular purpose and then referred for ratification to the representatives of the people in the several States. This hand-me-down method of writing constitutions and laws exemplified in the procedure of the Paris conference is familiar enough in Europe, where governments and not the people are the sources of authority, but it is an absolutely new experience here. That such a procedure is defended by anybody in the United States is evidence that "the wiles of foreign influence" and the seduction of alien ideals are at work in America to the possible undoing of the Republic.

"Why is it seriously proposed that the question of whether the people of this country shall underwrite the political and financial and commercial solvency of the rest of the world and bind themselves to duties and responsibilities and burdens and possible sacrifices and dangers vaguely defined shall be decided in a military council assembled for the purpose of formulating terms of peace after a great war, a body totally unrepresentative in a legislative way?

"Would it not be the natural and the legal procedure for this body to settle the issues of the war, leaving the establishment of a world constitutional convention and the election of the members thereof to the various governments of the world in accordance with their usual procedure in such matters? For instance, should not the legislative representatives of the United States in such a body be chosen by the Congress of the United States rather than by the Executive merely? Is it not an act of the most supreme assurance, the most flagrant usurpation, for this peace conference to dodge all the problems properly falling within its jurisdiction and turn instead to the task, never committed to it, of writing a constitution for a world government, throwing over on this proposed world government the vast and perilous unsettled business the Paris peace conference does not seem to have the courage or capacity to finish?

"We say this question of usurpation of authority to write a world constitution and give the people of this Republic no initiative in its formulation; this organized effort so apparent throughout the country to hush criticism, prevent discussion, and hurry action; this manifest determination to deprive even the United States Senate of its constitutional part in the framing of treaties; this feverish, wholesale, strongly organized, and heavily financed propaganda against deliberation and in favor of implicit consent to anything suggested by authority—all this ought to arouse in every American the firm determination that with so much at stake the people and the Congress of the United States must have something to say in the framing of this document, rather than be content with the poor satisfaction of humbly suggesting minor amendments.

"The Paris peace conference should long ago have settled the problems arising out of the war. It should have settled them many weeks ago. It would have settled them long ago except for the stubborn persistence of certain men, acting entirely in a personal capacity, in neglecting the real work of the conference in order to take up a clearly usurped function of framing a world constitution. By this course the whole fabric of civilization, at least in Europe, has been endangered.

"It is not too late to remedy this frightful error, originating in the spirit of autocracy, that spirit this war was fought to overthrow. Let the peace conference settle the war problems. Let the allied peoples and Governments, which have won the right to leadership in this work of building bulwarks for the defense of world peace, elect through their representative legislative bodies real representatives of the popular sentiment of these several nations. Let these men deliberately and intelligently debate and decide, with due deference to American public opinion, upon a proposed plan for the permanent preservation of the world's peace; whether or not they want an international court, interpreting a comprehensive code of international law, or a world legislature. Let discussion of this vitally important project be encouraged rather than discouraged. This is democracy. This is republicanism. Any other course is autocracy, not to be accepted by any free people whose sense of responsibility has not been blunted by the aggressions of tyrannical usurpation.

"There is a right way and a wrong way of going about this matter. We want no world constitution, full of vague generalities, advocated on the ground of good intentions on the idiotic theory that contracts should be signed first and considered afterwards. We want no patchwork world constitution, with an amendment stuck on here and there to hide the blemishes and allay the suspicions of the people. We want an 'open covenant, openly arrived at' in the old-fashioned American way, in which the people, through their duly chosen representatives, exercise initiative in formulating the proposed world constitution.

"This, it seems to us, is the most fundamental issue involved in this whole matter. It is a question of representative govern-

ment as against autocratic usurpation. It is a question of bringing to bear upon this question the power of deliberate public opinion in a country which has become accustomed to this method of settling questions vitally affecting the destiny of the American people, as this one does so peculiarly.

"Let the 39 Senators who signed the new Declaration of Independence and the other Senators in sympathy with their position take their stand here.

"Get peace quickly; get a world constitution deliberately and in the democratic-republican way.

"If we are true to the traditions of this Republic and of free government in general, there is no other road for us as Americans to travel."

What Washington fought to achieve
And Lincoln died to maintain,
No successor can make us believe
They won for their country in vain.

AN HOUR FOR PLACING PATRIOTISM ABOVE POLITICS.

"It is unfortunate that President Wilson and the Democratic Senators who serve only as phonographic records of their party master's voice continue to persist in playing politics with the league of nations issue.

"Of course, if it had been the desire of President Wilson or his party henchmen in the Senate to bring about the creation of a satisfactory league of nations, they would have accorded some consideration to the views of the majority Members of the United States Senate, as anticipated by the national Constitution, knowing as they did that ratification of the treaty by a two-thirds vote of the Senate was vital to the very creation of the league.

"Instead of this they have taken just the position that would be expected of politicians not primarily anxious for the adoption of a league of nations, but to force the political opposition into what they believe would be a 'hole,' by attempting to make the public believe that the Republican Senators oppose any arrangement for forming a world organization to prevent war in so far as this may be accomplished by international action.

"The President and his political organs and creatures in public life have been studiously insulting in their attitude toward all opposition to any feature of the proposals brought home from Paris. They have substituted abuse for argument and have gone deliberately to work to infuriate the opposition by personal attack and imputation against the integrity of their motives. This, of course, is not the natural policy of men anxious to secure approval of the league plan in a form consistent with American traditions and institutions.

"The meaning of the insistence of the administration that the Paris covenant must be accepted just as written or not at all is that it is not half so much interested in the adoption of a league of nations plan as in manipulating the situation to its own immediate political advantage. This is the meaning of the position taken by President Wilson that the treaty must be ratified without the slightest change or rejected in its entirety. It is accompanied by the assertion that if it be changed President Wilson will run for a third term on the issue which he has thus created.

The Democratic national politicians evidently overlook the fact that the people of this country will be able to locate the responsibility if through the unreasonable and implacable course of President Wilson and his shadows in the Capitol the country is refused the alternative of making amendments and reservations in the interests of this Nation. The course pursued of saying to the Senate, 'You must take this world constitution just as it is, without change, reservation, or amendment, or reject the whole scheme,' is, of course, thoroughly un-American, thoroughly autocratic, entirely out of harmony with the spirit of American institutions. It represents an effort to substitute the fiat of one stubborn officeholder, party leader, and candidate for reelection to office, for the constitutional determination of the most important foreign question which has ever come before the American people for settlement.

"By this attitude President Wilson makes himself and his methods an issue of transcendent importance. Has the time come when we are ready in this country for a Government by one man, with every other department of Government reduced to that same pitiable servility which characterizes the present position of the Democratic Members of the Senate, who, in the interests of party, have surrendered their right of independent judgment to the will of the leader who now owns and controls the political organization to which they give their first allegiance?

"It might be well for the Democratic bosses, from the highest to the lowest, to make a little more thorough examination of the state of public sentiment in this country before they carry

to its conclusion their present policy of considering this matter of the foreign relations of the United States from the viewpoint only of personal and partisan advantage. That the propaganda is practically all one way is true. Some people mistake propaganda for public sentiment; the Democratic politicians made that mistake last fall when they agreed upon President Wilson's campaign letter saying a Republican victory would amount to a repudiation of his leadership. The utter insincerity of that plea has, of course, been demonstrated by the course of President Wilson in continuing to proclaim to Europe and the world in general that he is the sole representative of the American people and the one and only interpreter of their thoughts.

"There was a time when the signet ring of an autocrat was sufficient to the validation of a treaty binding a people. Long ago, however, we emerged in this country from the atmosphere of the treaty of Vienna. European nations may suppose that President Wilson's signet ring is the official representation of the will of the American people, but on this side of the Atlantic it is fully understood that this is a representative Republic and not an unlimited monarchy that may fairly be considered the personal asset of a reigning house. The Senate of the United States, therefore, despite the vicious abuse that administration claquers continue to heap upon it because of its disposition to do the sworn duty of an American Senate, will consider this arrangement entered into at Paris, without the participation or even the knowledge of the American people, upon its merits.

"Possibly it might be good party strategy for Republican Members of the Senate to counter the move of the Democratic leaders by letting the covenant go through as it stands and thus permit the country to pass a judgment everybody knows has already been made up, upon the party in power, on domestic issues at the next election. That might be good politics, but it would be poor patriotism. This is no time for partisan maneuvering. It is a time for undivided and undiluted Americanism, and fortunate it is that despite the effort to intimidate the Senate through vast and powerful agencies of propaganda or to bribe the Senate majority by the promise of personal or party advantage through acquiescence in the sacrifice of American sovereignty and independence upon the altar of socialistic and imperialistic internationalism, the men in the Senate who are thinking of this whole problem only from the standpoint of the rights and interests of their country can not be scared or bribed to subordinate these to the supposed exigencies of politics."

IT'S TIME TO MAKE JUNK OF AMERICAN JUNKERISM.

"Through the New York World, Democratic Party organ, the administration launches its movement to gain control of the Senate, in the face of the administration's repudiation at the polls in November last, by unseating Senator NEWBERRY, who defeated the administration candidate, Henry Ford, of the *Oskar II*.

"It may be well for Congress to go back of the returns in the Michigan case. But when that is done, if there is anything more than thin gruel in the veins of Republicans and Americans generally in Congress, the whole question of majority rule in elections will be taken up; majority rule not only in Michigan, but in Mississippi, in South Carolina, in all the rotten-borough States through whose flagrant and notorious violations of the spirit and letter of the American Constitution the Democratic majority in the electoral college which put the present national administration in power was created.

"The hypocrisy of the outcry of the administration politicians in favor of free and fair and honest elections becomes apparent when it is recalled that there is not a State in the Union under Republican control in which majority rule is not possible under the laws and practices of the State, whereas there is not a State in the Union under Democratic domination where the laws and practices established by Democratic junkerism do not make majority rule difficult, if not impossible.

"More votes were cast in the single Republican State of Illinois in the last election than in all the States of the solid Democratic South—the old slave States, plus Oklahoma, another Commonwealth dominated by slave-State Democracy. In the State of Virginia, upon whose green fields President Wilson may look from his study windows as he writes his soulful periods about 'the rule of the people,' five-sixths of the men conscripted to fight to save the world for democracy are politically disinherited under a State constitution Mr. Wilson's Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Glass, helped to frame, and which, in violation of promise, was foisted upon the people of Patrick Henry's State by proclamation, without giving them a chance to vote upon it. Out of a total population of two and a third millions there are only 150,000

Virginians eligible to vote under the sway of a party which has put the 'mock' in democracy wherever it has been given complete control. At the election of 1918 only 50,000 votes were cast in Virginia. This condition is typical of that prevailing in all the old slave States dominated by that faction of the so-called Democratic Party now in power. In a number of the Southern States the conditions are more damnable than they are in Virginia, and it is by reason of these conditions that the present administration, in full sympathy with them, is in power. This paper has printed many columns of facts and figures on this subject. President Wilson has recently nominated as United States district attorney the Democratic State chairman in Josephus Daniels's State, under whose direction the election of 1918 was made a travesty in North Carolina, and who even issued a letter through his county chairmen to the partisan registrars whose right to control the privileges of voters in the State has been judicially decided to be absolute, directing them to violate the law by voting sick voters, although at home, under an absent voters' statute, but admonishing them not to let the Republicans know about their intentions. The question of how many United States Senators want to indicate their indorsement of such methods, and even put law-enforcement machinery in the hands of such politicians, will soon be up for public decision in the vote taken upon the confirmation of this administration nominee.

"The Federal Constitution contains a mandatory provision for the reduction of representation in Congress and the electoral college of any State which limits the number of persons privileged to vote. Notoriously the States of the solid South have reduced their voting population 70 per cent. In so doing they have disfranchised twice as many white men as black. They not only deny the ballot to a majority of the national citizenship of these States but add insult to injury by demanding the right to have this decitizenized population fully represented in the House of Representatives and the electoral college. The title of the present national administration to authority is based upon this fraudulent system, for it determined the election result of 1916.

"Upon the census of 1920 a reapportionment of Members of the House of Representatives and presidential electors will be made. It is the duty of the present Congress to determine officially the extent to which there has been suppression of the electorate in the several States of the Union. Without violation of their oaths of office Members of the next Congress can not avoid applying the penalty prescribed by the Constitution for the denial of suffrage rights to male citizens 21 years of age and over. The political leadership which says that a man is not a citizen because of his color or because of his failure to possess certain ancestral qualifications is guilty of political embezzlement when it seeks and exercises determinative political power based upon the political inheritance of which that man has been robbed. The failure of Congress to remedy this situation is a disgrace to the legislative branch of Government and to the Republican Party. It has been prevented by a combination of southern political junkers and northern political doughfaces, including Democrats, who have always been, in the North, slaves to their southern masters, and Republicans who have been deterred by alleged arguments based upon the strategy of cowardice from doing what is very clear has long been their duty as believers in free government and as sworn officials of that government.

"Again, unless the cause of free government is longer to be betrayed in the States where the dominant faction of the Democratic Party is in control, there must be Federal supervision of elections where Federal officials are chosen. Organs of the administration which favor any fraud that will help a deserving Democrat will cry 'force bill,' as the New York World did under the Harrison administration when an effort was made to insure a free ballot and a fair count everywhere throughout the country at national elections. At the last general election in the State of Josephus Daniels one of the 39 kinds of fraud detailed in a statement issued by a Republican State conference held at Greensboro on February 15 was that the registrar of a Republican precinct went hunting on election day, carrying the records with him, and thus prevented an election. Under a Federal election law men who pull stunts of that kind would be brought to the bar of justice instead of being awarded the local post office or appointed to United States district attorneyships by an administration which is busily engaged in supplying the export demand for 'democracy.'

"Yes; throw the Michigan election open in order that we may know how the poor but honest Henry Ford was deprived of a seat to which he was appointed by President Wilson, and to which he is therefore entitled by divine right. But at the same time throw open to the public gaze this whole system of rotan-

borough representation, of political intolerance, tyranny, fraud, proscription, persecution, theft, and skulduggery in the States which for years have given to the Democratic Party its only hope of serious consideration as a factor in national politics. Reveal through this exposure the nauseating hypocrisy of the administration's pretense to any interest whatever in 'democracy' among the peons of Mexico and the peasants of Europe. Emancipate the old slave States from the new political slavery which puts them to the forefront in illiteracy, poverty, backward industrial development, inadequate banking facilities, bad roads, and run-down farms, and relegates them to the tail end of the national procession in almost everything that stands for human progress and the amelioration of social and industrial conditions. Restore free speech and a free press, independent thought and action, in that section which has been dominated for years by a sort of home-grown political Prussianism, and has finally introduced the people of the Nation generally to bureaucratic autocracy of a type with which Americans outside the solid-south States had hitherto been unfamiliar, thus teaching us that we can not safely be indifferent to the lynching of democracy anywhere within the borders of the Republic.

"Whether or not such a policy would immediately benefit the Republican Party is not the question. The question is whether this country is going to endure longer half slave and half free politically. The question is whether politicians are going to be permitted to pose as apostles of democracy before the world and be known as perpetrators of autocracy in their own Commonwealths. The question is whether these junkers and their official organs shall be permitted to focus the attention of the country upon the 'wrongs' against majority rule in Michigan, where free government has always prevailed, and thus divert it from the States they dominate, where by force, fraud, and legal trickery free government has been overthrown. Unless this situation be faced and attacked the emblem of Republicanism should be changed from the elephant to the rabbit."

WHY RESERVE DEMOCRACY FOR THE EXPORT TRADE.

"In his cabled message to Congress President Wilson writes:

"How are the men and women who do the daily labor of the world to obtain progressive improvement in the conditions of their labor to be made happier and to be served better by the communities which their labor sustains and advances? How are they to be given their right advantage as citizens and human beings? We can not go any farther in our present direction. We have already gone too far.

"These are questions which, before taking up with Congress, we advise President Wilson to sit down and talk over with 22 Democratic Senators from the old slave States, the leaders in public life with whom he is in closest touch and sympathy. With his intimate friends and advisers, Senators JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS and PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, for instance, he might talk over the problem of how the men and women who 'do' most of the manual 'labor' undertaken in that State are to be 'served better' than by a vigilance committee whenever they undertake to proceed upon the theories so soulfully expressed by the President; how they are to be 'given their right advantage as citizens and human beings.' Out of a population of 1,797,014 there are 1,009,487 black 'human beings' in Mississippi, 'citizens' under the National Constitution. In his appeals to the 'proletariat,' though they may be intended entirely for Northern States politically doubtful, Mr. Wilson should not overlook their application to the States where his political associates are in control of affairs and have seen to it that 'the men and women who do the daily work' are 'kept in their places,' and from having any more hand in running their Government than the Russian serfs under the eighteenth century czars.

"After getting Mississippi lined up for the ideals President Wilson so soulfully writes about, he might call in Senators SMITH and DIAL, of South Carolina, of whose 1,515,400 people 835,843 are black 'human beings' and 'citizens' under the terms of the American Constitution; they do most of 'the daily labor' in that State. Here is a fertile field for President Wilson's endeavors, the beauty of it all being that all he will have to do to bring about his high object is to convince his own close political partners that he means what he says. Notoriously these 835,843 negro proletarians—the only real proletarians we have in the United States, by the way—are denied a look-in at the elections which provide for them a Government, and while they are counted as citizens when it comes to reckoning seats in Congress and votes in the electoral college, they are counted nowhere else. A distinguished leader of President Wilson's own party said on the floor of the Senate that when any of these negro proletarians attempted to vote 'we shot 'em, we killed 'em, and we buried 'em in the sand.' It is well known that this would happen again if any of these negro 'human beings' and

citizens' who 'do the work' in South Carolina attempted to exercise even that most fundamental right of citizenship—the right to vote. There is every reason to believe that President Wilson is in full sympathy with the policy of preventing these proletarians from any hand in political self-determination. If, since going to Paris, he has had a change of heart, as his message to Congress would indicate, why not prove his sincerity by cleaning his own political house, where he is absolute master of the situation, before coming to a divided Congress to press further reform in those portions of the Nation in which such denial of the 'rights' of the 'human beings and citizens' who 'do the work' is entirely unknown?

"When President Wilson has given evidence that he is talking in good faith and not merely exuding political bunk by starting to clean his own political stable in South Carolina and Mississippi there will still be plenty of work of the same kind to do in nine other old slave States, and the State of Oklahoma, dominated by the old slave-State democracy, where laws and practices are an expression of political autocracy rather than of even the most retrograde variety of democracy. Besides the black proletarians in these States who have been politically disinherited are the white 'workers' of the same States in even larger number, for the political junkers who constitute the bone and sinew of President Wilson's personally conducted party have denied the most fundamental citizenship rights of more white men than black in the State they dominate. These white men are for the most part of the laboring 'class.' Like the negro workers of the South, they seem to excite no enthusiasm among those who think of the uplift only in terms of votes that will give them personal or political advantage. Even Mr. Gompers doesn't know they are alive; at any rate, he has never uttered a word of protest against disfranchisement of 80 per cent of the wage earners of the solid Democratic States.

"Included in the dozen millions of 'human beings' and 'citizens' who have for generations been 'doing the work' of President Wilson's particular section of the country, but who are excluded from that passion for human rights President Wilson uses so liberally in supplying the northern and export trade, are hundreds of thousands of men called to the military service of their country in the war to 'save the world for democracy.' 'How are they to be given their right advantage as citizens and human beings?' For, as President Wilson says, 'we can not go any further in our present direction. We have already gone too far.'

"Yes, indeed. What is Mr. Wilson going to do about it? What are his partners in Democratic leadership who have put the 'mock' in 'democracy' and lynched majority rule through the States they dominate, in so doing, in the name of 'nigger domination,' politically disinherited more white men than black; what are they going to do about it? Southern demagogues have for years been preaching, outside of Dixie, the right of the down-trodden proletariat to rule. They have been preaching this doctrine in territory normally under Republican rule, and therefore where the 'human beings' and national 'citizens' who 'do the work' are permitted to freely and fully exercise the rights of citizenship. What's the matter with pushing this appeal south of the Ohio? If appeals to class hatred, to envy, to the prejudice against property and enterprise, to ignorance and the sense of wrong, is good in the Republican States of the Union, why not in the States dominated by the Democratic politicians and where the basis for such an appeal really exists among the 'proletariat'?"

"At any rate, let the Democratic leadership of this country turn to the job of sweeping the debris from its own doorstep before unloading upon the country hypocritical gibberish about the vindication of the rights of the social and economic under dogs. Congress should demand to know of Mr. Wilson what his views are as to the rights of the southern proletariat in that portion of the country dominated by his own political machine, and where existing conditions give the lie to every profession of passion for social and economic and political equality such as he is preaching to the rest of this country and to the world. And as for Republican leadership, why does it overlook the opportunity, in view of the vivid contrast between Democratic theory and Democratic practice in the fundamentals of democracy, to slay the Democratic party with the jawbone of its own ass?"

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE J. WILLARD RAGSDALE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. J. WILLARD RAGSDALE, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 23, 1919.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. J. Willard Ragsdale, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Members of the House, with such members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolutions which I send to the desk. I should like to state before the reading of the resolutions that at the proper time I shall have something further to say in reference to the death of my friend Mr. RAGSDALE. We were all shocked to hear of his sudden and untimely death at noon to-day. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolutions.

The resolutions (S. Res. 131) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. J. WILLARD RAGSDALE, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join a committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 24, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, July 23, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, whose life is our life, whose spirit is our spirit, whose wisdom is our wisdom, whose love is our love—all these precious gifts are ours if we shall put ourselves in harmony with Thee—let Thy blessing be upon these Thy servants; keep them in health and strength; and let Thy healing touch be upon those who are sick and afflicted, that they may come back to do the work they have been called to do. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday when the vote was taken on H. R. 5276, the Nolan minimum-wage bill. I simply wish to state that if I had been present I would have voted "aye."

ABSENCE OF A QUORUM.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a quorum to transact the public business.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri make the point of no quorum?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves a call of the House.

The question was taken, and a call of the House was ordered. The Doorkeeper was ordered to close the doors and the Clerk to call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Dyer	Kahn	Reed, W. Va.
Ashbrook	Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Riordan
Barkley	Echols	Kennedy, Iowa	Robinson, N. C.
Benson	Ellsworth	Kennedy, R. I.	Rouse
Briggs	Fairfield	Kettner	Rowan
Britten	Flood	Kincheloe	Scully
Browne	Fordney	King	Siegel
Brumbaugh	Frear	Lee, Ga.	Slemp
Burdick	Gandy	Lever	Smith, N. Y.
Burke	Ganly	Little	Snyder
Caldwell	Garland	McClintic	Stegall
Campbell, Pa.	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Steele
Candler	Goldfogle	McGlennon	Sullivan
Cantrill	Goodall	McKiniry	Taylor, Ark.
Coady	Goodykoontz	McKinley	Thompson, Okla.
Cooper	Gould	Mason	Tilson
Copley	Graham, Pa.	Miller	Vare
Costello	Hamill	Neely	Volstead
Crago	Hamilton	Paige	Ward
Currie, Mich.	Haskell	Parker	Wilson, Pa.
Davis, Minn.	Hicks	Porter	Wingo
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Purnell	Woodyard
Donovan	Husted	Ragsdale	
Doolling	Jones, Pa.	Randall, Calif.	
Doughton	Jones, Tex.	Reed, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this call 333 Members have answered to their names—a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

REFERENCE OF A BILL—H. R. 4380.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to change the reference of the bill H. R. 4380, relative to the compensation and insurance of soldiers, from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that that does not come up properly to-day. The gentleman should bring that up to-morrow.

Mr. STEVENSON. I am asking unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

Mr. STEVENSON. It is to refer to the gentleman's Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a bill relating to compensation in insurance. I saw the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, as the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] was not present, but I have a letter from the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] stating that the bill went to the wrong committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the change of reference?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD the proceedings in the awarding of a congressional medal to a soldier in my district, who was killed on the 8th of October, it being the second medal awarded in that town of 1,500 inhabitants.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BEE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. COOPER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. DONOVAN, for 10 days, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. CANDLER, for one week, on account of attending Sovereign Camp of Woodmen of the World in Chicago as a delegate from Mississippi.

To Mr. WINGO, for five days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. MILLER, for to-day (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Washington), on account of illness.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the roll of committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Patents.

AMENDING THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 3754, to amend sections 8 and 21 of the copyright act, approved March 4, 1909, the unfinished Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, no one seems to have charge of the time in opposition to this bill, and, pro forma, I shall take the hour myself, if there is no objection, and yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon].

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, can we not have some understanding with respect to the matter? I understand that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] desires to speak on a subject outside of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He wants to speak on postal matters.

Mr. NOLAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Newton] would like to have 20 minutes to speak on a subject outside of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no objection to the gentleman having 20 minutes if he will not make a political speech. I have no objection to political speeches, but I want to know when they are going to come.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I want to speak on conscientious objectors.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is all right.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have speeches contrary to the rule, exceptions should not be made in one case and not in another. My understanding is that there is no objection to the gentleman from Missouri granting the gentleman from Tennessee 35 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota 20 minutes, contrary to rule and not on the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall not make any exception.

Mr. MONDELL. Then I do not think that the gentleman should insist that he shall visit the speeches.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that it might be wise to ask unanimous consent that gentlemen speak on a subject different from the bill, because the rule requires that on Calendar Wednesday debate shall be on the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, what I want is to get 35 minutes for Judge Moon, and I do not care three hoots what is done with the other 25 minutes, so long as they do not make political speeches.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is controlling part of the time that can be yielded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will yield 20 minutes to the gentleman, but he must not make a political speech.

Mr. MONDELL. But the speech the gentleman wants to make is a political speech, so we can not very well avoid that feature of it. It may be a political speech that will please the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I doubt it very much.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to recognize in the time of the gentleman from Missouri the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] for 35 minutes and in the time of the gentleman from California the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Newton] for 20 minutes to speak not pertinent to the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am perfectly willing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that in the hour in the control of the gentleman from Missouri the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] may speak for 35 minutes out of order and that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Newton] may speak for 20 minutes, not on the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NOLAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee wish to use the time now?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] will address the House for 35 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to make a partisan speech, but having been for eight years the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads I felt it was not only proper but somewhat my duty to make a purely business speech to this House on that question. It will be impossible for me in the course of 35 minutes or in an hour and 35 minutes to present all the facts, figures, statements, memoranda, and detail necessary to explain the general remarks in part which I shall make, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that these papers may be made a part of my remarks as exhibits A, B, C, and so forth.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by incorporating the papers referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, every civilized nation in the world has a postal system. The authority to establish one, of course, must arise from the organic law or the supreme power of the State. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States has provided that Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads. In the same article it is directed that Congress shall have power to pass the necessary and proper legislation to carry into effect the provisions of the Constitution. Of course you are all aware of the rule of construction that every power that may be fairly and justly implied from the express power may be exercised for the enforcement of that expressed power. The words "to establish post offices and post roads" have not only a legislative but a judicial construction. They import vastly more than they would seem to by the mere statement of the words. You are not limited to the establishment of post offices where mail may be delivered and sent out, but you can construct roads for the carrying of the mail. You may use all manner of vehicles, wagons, horses, motor cars, steamboats, railroads, ships; you may employ all the means that are necessary. That power is implied, and it carries with it, therefore, the power, if it be necessary to do so, to build and construct all of these instrumentalities. So the power of Congress is not limited in furnishing the means by which the post offices of the United States may be conducted. Furthermore, it is judicially held that it is a constitutional monopoly of all the means of communicating intelligence which the Government desires to assume under this provision of the Constitution. Therefore you can, if you desire it and think it wise, own the telegraphs and the telephones as an adjunct to the Post Office Department.

If you are unable to obtain or even desire to do so by the legislative discretion you have you can own the material of which to build boats and ships to carry your mails, you may own the forests and manufacture it, or you can take the coal mines for the purpose of making the steam necessary to carry the mails. The power is not only extensive, but it is complete and plenary in every way. It is exclusively a Federal power and you can do any and everything necessary to carry the mails and deliver them to the people of the country. You can force the railroads to do so and tax the price, provided that it is not confiscatory. But I must not dwell upon the power of Congress along that line; it is well known. I want to speak for a moment of the organization of this department. Under the Continental Congress before the Government of the United States was established there was a postal system at the head of which there was one of the greatest and best of American statesmen, Benjamin Franklin. He laid the foundation of the Postal System. He was allowed the sum of \$7,500 to conduct the Postal Service for one year when the population was less than four millions of people. Mr. Franklin was congratulated upon the fact that the receipts exceeded the expenditures by about \$50, and the people at that time were well satisfied with that service. But later on under the act of 1794 the present Post Office Department was established. That was in the time of Mr. Pickens, of Pennsylvania, who was Postmaster General, I believe, and was immediately followed by Mr. Habersham, of Georgia. There were at that time—1794—in the United States 450 post offices. In 1795 there were just three more. In 1901 there were 76,945 post offices in the United States, which was the highest number obtained. The number now is 54,345 on account of post offices being dispensed with by rural routes. In 1794 the gross revenue was \$128,947. The gross expenditures of the department were \$89,792. The gross revenues of the department in 1918 were \$388,974,902. The gross expenditures were \$324,383,728. In 1789 there was paid as compensation to postmasters \$1,657. In 1918 there was paid as compensation to postmasters \$31,421,536. Of course, I would not undertake to state the status during the 140 years of the Government's history. In the papers which I have obtained the consent of the House to add as an appendix I give year by year not only that information but other information in connection with this matter. The Postmaster General began the service with one assistant. Now he has four. The power of the department is not only derived from the Constitution but the laws passed in pursuance of it, Executive orders and administrative orders having the force and effect of law.

Under these orders the power has been extended over the personnel of the department. The power exists in pursuance of law to cover these employees of certain classes under the civil

service and to fix the tenure of office. The tendency all along in the growth, progress, and development of this great department has been to retain as far as possible those who are efficient in the service. And it may be that, in your wisdom, before a great while other steps along that line will have to be taken as to employment and retirement of postal employees, of which there are now more than 265,000.

Let me speak for a few moments about some of the laws and facts that are involved in the administration of the department. I can not enter into a discussion of all of them, of course, and I am going to make no invidious distinctions or comparisons upon these great business propositions between the political parties. Years ago, as those who were here 15 or 20 years ago know, the Congress of the United States relieved the Government from the bondage under which it existed to the railroad companies for the payment for special facilities and of exorbitant rates of transportation. Again the rate was reduced, and then came the recent measure that substituted a space basis for the weight basis in computing pay. Under the old basis you could not come within \$15,000,000 of the legitimate cost of the transportation of the mail. Under the space basis you can now make a settlement with the railroads every month or quarter, in exact figures, if you desire to do it. The result of the adoption of this law has been to make steady and stable the compensation, increasing only as the mail increases, and it has produced a revenue or has saved more than \$12,000,000 per annum in expenses. Of course, I can not go into the details of a discussion as to how that happened. We adopted the parcel post, and by the use of a distinctive stamp and other methods by which we could segregate the revenues it was ascertained under the parcel-post system that the Government of the United States had earned about \$11,800,000 in 1916. The conditions since that time have been such that we are unable to tell what the earnings were; but they were greater.

You established a postal savings bank. My judgment at the time it was done was that it was a mistake; that it had better not be done. But time has demonstrated that I was mistaken on that question. It has been a wonderful instrumentality of the Government in the savings of the people. The revenues from that source alone last year were \$1,900,000.

You all understand that the great portion of your revenues are derived from first-class mail. Second-class mail does not pay. It costs you as an individual under the present law 32 cents a pound to carry your mail across the continent, or from one point to another outside the place of mailing. It costs the magazines and newspapers only 1 cent a pound, plus a slight amount under the recent revenue act for advertisements with the application of the zone system. It is hardly consistent to say that the newspapers and magazines should pay only 1 cent or 2 cents when you pay 32 cents. It is proper that the Government of the United States give some concession to them by reason of the fact that they disseminate knowledge and information, and I would be willing to see them have concessions, even less than the cost of carriage, but that difference—32 to 1—is wrong. You have to remedy that, particularly as to these great magazines. I refer now to one magazine in the medium class, a publication that pays \$5,000 revenue to the Government in stamps, and costs the Government \$49,000 a year to carry it, when its profits are more than \$150,000 per annum. But I pass over that question with the simple statement that the cost of the carrying of this class of mail in the last fiscal year was about \$70,000,000 more than the Government received. Now, this Government ought not to submit to such a subsidy to the press or to any other power in the country. Great and powerful as the corporations of the country were—the transportation companies—you wrested from them subsidies under which they had increased their compensation in 30 years from \$7,000,000 to \$64,000,000. You have to wrest that power from the senders of mail matter of the second class. There is no man more friendly to the press and who has stood for it more in this House than I have; no one is more willing to make concessions than I am; but it must not demand a loss of \$70,000,000 to the American people to carry their mail, mostly commercial and profit making.

There is another question, which is a rather delicate one, that I want to talk to you about.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield to a question at that point?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. How can we vote for a 1-cent postage on first-class mail matter unless other classes of mail matter come more nearly paying the cost of transportation?

Mr. MOON. That is one of the policies I want to discuss when I get some other facts before the House.

A delicate question for the Congressman, and particularly the country Congressman, is the question of rural mails. What is the situation to-day as to rural mails? The last fiscal year shows that when you charge properly the cost to that service at the initial point and terminal point, and the overhead charges that belong to it separately in the segregation of the mail, you lose \$58,300,000 per annum. In other words, it took that much of money more than the receipts from that source to meet the demands of that service.

The Postal Service of the United States is a unit. Some of it may raise great revenue, some of it may produce a great deficit, but you must maintain it all. You have to serve all of the American people and give them the best possible service. I want to suggest to you, for your thought in the future, that you must find a remedy by which we can give to the country people the service that they are entitled to, which is the best, and at the same time reduce this cost. It is a matter for your thoughtful consideration. The country people are reasonable and just. They want the best service at the least cost to their country. While, of course, we all favor the proper care of and the payment of proper salaries to carriers of the mail, it is the people, at last, whose rights must be protected. If you can remedy this situation and still give an efficient and proper service, which I hope you can, and remedy the situation as to second-class mail, then the American people upon the face of the figures can have 1-cent letter postage with still a surplus of \$25,000,000 in the National Treasury. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of the laws which we have passed that made it possible to produce a surplus instead of a deficit were not enacted previous to 1912. One of those laws was enacted at that time. Another, that enabled us to go to this position, was enacted previous to that time. Two of these laws were enacted under two administrations, one wholly Republican and another partly Republican. The others have all been enacted since the Democratic administration began. Now, it would be hardly fair, perhaps, to make comparisons, except to demonstrate the system of operation under the laws between any periods of time in these services performed under different laws and conditions, the hardest conditions having been in the last 6 or 8 years. The Postal System grows, its needs appear year by year, and the remedies to correct errors that have come into it or may come must be devised. Constructive legislation must continue to come if this great department must at last accomplish the good of which it is capable for the people. But, as showing a development of the service under valuable laws and what may be expected of other laws and better conditions which we may yet establish, it appears from the record that during the administration of President Roosevelt there was a deficit in this service of about \$47,000,000, covering the last four years of that period. That was not the fault of the administration any more than it is the fault of this administration that now and then letters go wild or that the service in some places is not as good as it should be. It is the necessary result of conditions and the law controlling the department and, of course, in part as to administration. There was a loss, I say, during that period of about \$47,000,000, in round figures.

During the administration of President Taft there was a loss of about \$25,000,000. During the administration of President Wilson, under Mr. Burleson as Postmaster General, all of these losses have been overcome and a large surplus gained in revenues. The postal bill has gone to the enormous figure of \$600,000,000, \$200,000,000 of which, however, was for good roads. Yet the official figures show that these losses during that period have been overcome and that the service has been extended to 15,000,000 more of people daily than we had before; that it has been expanded and greatly enlarged; that salaries have been increased; and yet those six years, overcoming that deficit, show a surplus of about \$32,500,000—not a paper profit, not a bookkeeping proposition, but actual cash turned over on the check of the Postmaster General to the Treasurer of the United States of nearly \$33,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But some have said that that is due to the increased expense of postage during the war. Ah, you are mistaken. Under that law that revenue was segregated from the other, and the Post Office Department collected about \$44,500,000 war revenue under the 3-cent postage act and paid that into the Treasury, and it is no part of the general profits of \$32,000,000 that have been referred to.

The record shows that during the eight-year period preceding the present administration, covering the last administration of President Roosevelt and the administration of President Taft,

the deficiencies in revenues as shown by the audited reports of the Postal Service were as follows:

1905 audited deficiency	\$14,594,387.12	
1906 audited deficiency	10,542,941.76	
1907 audited deficiency	6,692,031.47	
1908 audited deficiency	16,910,278.99	
Total deficiency		\$48,739,639.34
1909 audited deficiency	\$17,479,770.47	
1910 audited deficiency	5,881,481.95	
1911 surplus, alleged and disputed	219,118.12	
1912 audited deficiency	1,785,523.10	
Total deficiency		24,927,657.40

Deficiency for the eight-year period..... 78,667,296.74
Audited statement for year 1911 shows surplus accounts subsequently settled reduced the surplus to a deficiency of \$732,301.90.

The postal revenue as audited shows a surplus in all succeeding years, except 1915, in which the receipts of the Postal Service suffered a temporary setback after the outbreak of the war in Europe.

A statement of surpluses and deficiencies follows:

Audited surpluses by years:	
1913	\$4,510,650.91
1914	4,376,463.05
1916	5,829,236.07
1917	9,836,211.90
1918 (excluding \$44,500,000 excess postage as war revenue)	19,626,774.08
Total surpluses	44,179,336.01
Audited deficiency 1915 (declining receipts following outbreak of war in Europe)	11,333,308.97
Net surplus for six-year period	32,846,027.04

Mr. Speaker, as stated, I can only speak at this time in a general way. There have been, perhaps, just complaints; there have been many unjust complaints against the department. You must recollect the period through which we have passed, the circumstances that might bring about these conditions, the existence of war and all of its evils and demoralization; and yet I have to assert that there have been no more mistakes made in the Post Office Department during the last few years than were ever made during any other similar number of years of its existence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The words of envy and malice and of unjust criticism that have been uttered against the Postmaster General will be forgotten—forgotten quickly in the face of his magnificent administration, distinguished as it is for ability, honor, courage, and unsurpassed, if not matchless, loyalty to public duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to speak a word for the extension of this great department. It has already lengthened its cords and strengthened its stakes until it is reaching the four quarters of the earth. It works for you by day and by night, on land, on sea, and in mid-air, and wherever the flag of the Union floats there may be found the mails of the Republic. It gives greater benefit to the people than all other agencies of Government. Far beyond the confines of the United States, by conventions with the peoples of the earth, your mails are carried to the soldier on the battle fronts, to the sailor on the mighty deep, to the marts of commerce, to the halls of legislation, to the seats of learning, to the home, the factory, and the field, to men under every condition.

This great department may drop a missile on the sands of Arabia, on the snows of Iceland, on the Alps, at the foot of the Pyramids, on the banks of the Nile, where Leonidas fought and the Spartans fell, where the beautiful gondolas of war proudly rode the waves of the Aegian Sea, where Virgil and Homer sang, where Babylon and Nineveh were but are not, to bear the tidings of the love, the hope, and the aspirations of kindred spirits far away. [Applause.]

Strike down this means of communicating knowledge and information among the people, and the flickering light of modern civilization will fade forever beneath the coming shadows and darkness of advancing barbarism. Let me appeal to you to broaden and extend this great service, that it may aid in holding up the standard of human liberty wherever man loves freedom. Above all, let me appeal to you to encourage and care for that splendid army of intelligent men and women who so magnificently administer the Postal System. [Applause.]

Papers and exhibits referred to by Mr. Moon:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1919.

Hon. JOHN A. MOON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MOON: In reply to your letter of the 8th instant requesting certain information, you are advised as follows:
The number of clerks and officials in the Post Office Department at Washington: Clerks, 997; officials, 59.

The number of first, second, third, and fourth class postmasters in the United States: First class, 628; second class, 2,372; third class, 7,823; fourth class, 42,261.

The number of rural routes and carriers: Rural routes, 43,211; rural carriers, 43,100.

The number of city carriers: Regular carriers, 35,200; substitute carriers, 8,755.

The number of post-office clerks: Regular clerks, 46,707; substitute clerks, 11,676.

The number of railway postal clerks: 19,968.

The number of post-office inspectors: 418.

The approximate number of laborers connected with the Post Office Department: Post Office Department proper, 96; Postal Service, 2,280. The total number of postal employees in the United States: Postal Service, 262,294; department proper, 1,374; total, 263,668.

The countries with which we have postal conventions and the rates of postage: See attached memorandum marked "Exhibit A."

The approximate cost of handling and transporting the second-class mails: See attached letter dated July 10, 1919, marked "Exhibit B."

The amount of money saved by the adoption of the space basis as against the weight basis, \$11,470,708 per annum.

The approximate number of pounds of second-class mail matter in the last fiscal year, and the loss to the Government on same. See Exhibit B, hereto attached.

Profits in postal savings banks. See attached memorandum marked Exhibit C.

Statement of the receipts from the Postal Service and the expenditures from the beginning of the service to date, together with the deficiencies or surpluses, by years. See page 2 of Exhibit D attached, columns 5 and 6 of which show, respectively, the gross revenues of the department and the gross expenditures of the department from the year 1789 to the year 1918, inclusive.

List of the Postmasters General and the periods of their service. See page 1 of Exhibit D.

The increase in employees and salaries: The bases for the figures here presented are June 30, 1913, the close of the fiscal year on the 4th of March of which this administration began, and July 1, 1919, the beginning of the current fiscal year.

On June 30, 1913, there were 235,409 employees in the Postal Service, with annual salaries aggregating \$176,591,358. On July 1, 1919, there were 262,294 employees, with annual salaries aggregating \$274,911,832. The percentage of increase in employees during the period was 11.42, and the percentage of increase in the aggregate compensation paid was 55.67.

In the department proper there were on June 30, 1913, 1,237 employees, with annual salaries aggregating \$1,440,240. On July 1, 1919, there were 1,374 employees, with annual salaries aggregating \$2,040,548. The percentage of increase in employees during the period was 11.07, and the percentage of increase in the aggregate compensation paid was 41.67.

The above figures for July 1, 1919, include bonuses allowed by Congress.

In the contract service—that is, clerks at contract stations, mail messengers, screen-wagon contractors, steamboat and Alaska star service, and star routes—on July 1, 1913, there were 25,445 employees, with an annual rate of compensation aggregating \$12,232,140. On July 1, 1919, the number in such contract service was 25,124, with an annual rate of compensation aggregating \$18,064,780. The percentage of decrease in the number of contractors was 1.26 and the percentage of increase in the aggregate rate of compensation was 32.3.

Increase in number of people served with daily mail during this administration: It is estimated that since March 4, 1913, daily delivery service has been extended to 7,372,800 persons by city carriers, 4,986,079 persons by rural carriers, and 1,278,000 persons by village delivery carriers, or a total of 13,636,879 persons, who prior to that time were not receiving a delivery service.

With reference to your inquiry as to the approximate profits on parcel post, I beg to advise that on account of the many additional functions and duties placed upon the Postal Establishment incident to the war and the immense amount of work required to be performed by the Postal Service, and also because of the scarcity of help, the department did not have the facilities with which nor the time in which to gather statistics on this subject, consequently the last estimate made by the department was in 1916, when the figures compiled indicated a profit in round numbers of \$10,600,000 annually.

Concerning the loss on Rural Mail Delivery Service it is estimated that the cost of operating the service exceeds the revenues received therefrom in round numbers by \$53,800,000, after making due allowances to other branches of the service for handling mails which pass over rural routes and deducting overhead charges.

Sincerely, yours,

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

Average salaries June 30, 1913, and July 1, 1919, and percentages of increase.

Class of employees.	June 30, 1913.	July 1, 1919.	Per cent increase.
DEPARTMENT PROPER.			
All employees.....	\$1,185.73	\$1,486.32	27.1
POSTAL SERVICE.			
Post-office inspectors.....	1,804.45	2,043.30	13.23
Clerks, division headquarters, P. O. I.....	1,247.23	1,682.16	34.87
Clerks in post offices.....	1,064.66	1,401.46	31.63
City-delivery carriers.....	1,059.68	1,397.72	31.90
Railway postal clerks.....	1,239.00	1,649.00	33.09
Rural carriers.....	1,062.37	1,528.05	43.83
Postmasters ¹	502.38	679.82	35.31
Assistant postmasters.....	1,222.83	1,463.41	19.67

¹ The low average salary of postmasters is explained by the fact that the salaries of all postmasters (including those at offices of the third and fourth classes, where the salaries are quite low in a number of instances) are included in the computations.

EXHIBIT A.

CONVENTIONS PROVIDING FOR APPLICATION OF DOMESTIC RATES AND CONDITIONS.

Canada, Cuba, Mexico, and Panama.

CONVENTIONS PROVIDING FOR APPLICATION OF DOMESTIC RATE TO LETTERS ONLY.

Bahamas, Barbados, British Guiana, British Honduras, Dominican Republic, Dutch West Indies, England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Leeward Islands, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Trinidad (including Tobago), and Windward Islands (including Grenada, St. Vincent, the Grenadines, and St. Lucia).

PARCEL-POST CONVENTIONS (RATE GENERALLY 12 CENTS A POUND).

Argentina, Algeria, Alsace and Lorraine, Australia (including Tasmania), Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, British Guiana, British India, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Colombia, Corsica, Costa Rica, Curacao (including Aruba, Bonaire, Saba, St. Eustatius, and the Dutch part of St. Martinus), Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Dutch Guiana, France (excluding Algeria and Corsica), French Guiana, Gibraltar, Great Britain and Ireland, Greece, Guatemala, Guadeloupe (including Marie Galante, Desade, Les Salnts, St. Bartholomew, and the French portion of St. Martin), Haiti, Honduras (British), Honduras (Republic of), Hongkong, Iceland, Italy (including Republic of San Marino, etc.), Jamaica (including the Turks Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Japan (including Formosa, Karafuto (Japanese Saghalien), and Korea), Leeward Islands (Antigua with Barbuda and Redonda, St. Kitts, Nevis with Anguilla, Dominica, Montserrat, and the Virgin Islands, British), Liberia, Luxembourg, Madeira Islands, Martinique, Mesopotamia, Mexico, Netherlands, Netherlands East Indies, Newfoundland, New Zealand (including Fanning Island), Nicaragua, Norway, Palestine, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Roumania, Salvador, Siam, Society Islands, Sweden, Trinidad (including Tobago), Tunis, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent, the Grenadines, and St. Lucia).

Special agreement with Great Britain providing for reduced rates on printed matter for the blind.

S. M. WEBER,
Acting Superintendent.

JULY 9, 1919.

EXHIBIT B.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1919.

Hon. JOHN A. MOON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MOON: In response to your request with respect to the loss incident to handling and transporting mail matter of the second

class, I have to say that the figures pertaining to the mailings of such matter for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919, are not yet available. I am, therefore, furnishing you the data with regard to the mailings for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, at the rates in effect prior to July 1, 1918.

The Hughes Commission, created in 1911 under a joint resolution of Congress to investigate the subject, found that the cost of handling and transporting second-class matter in the case of matter mailed at the cent-a-pound rate was approximately 5½ cents a pound, exclusive of certain expenses, principally for services in post offices, which, because of the limited information regarding them, the commission did not assign. The department's estimate of the cost of handling and transporting this matter, including the expenses which the commission did not assign, was approximately 8.27 cents a pound. On the basis of the department's estimate at that time, which includes the unassigned expenses, the loss incident to handling and transporting second-class matter during the fiscal year 1918 would be as follows:

Pounds mailed at cent-a-pound rate and free in country	1,229,709,355
Estimated expense of handling and transporting	\$101,696,963
Amount of postage received	\$11,712,068
Estimated loss in handling and transporting	\$89,984,895

Since the cost of transporting free-in-county matter is somewhat less than the cost of transporting matter mailed at pound rates, and also on account of economies and improvements in the service, etc., the estimated loss as above shown may be reduced \$15,000,000, thus making the estimated loss in handling and transporting second-class matter during the fiscal year 1918, \$74,984,895.

Yours, very truly,

A. S. BURLINSON.

EXHIBIT C.

The postal-savings law provides that interest and profit accruing from the deposit and investment of postal-savings funds shall be applied to the payment of interest due to postal-savings depositors, as provided therein, and the excess covered into the Treasury of the United States as a part of the postal revenue. Pursuant to this direction there has been covered, or there is in process of being covered, into the Treasury the following amounts:

Net interest income accruing in the fiscal year.

1914	\$431,179.43
1915	584,176.89
1916	712,728.99
1917	1,121,901.30
1918 (estimated)	1,300,000.00
1919 (estimated)	1,600,000.00

Total 5,749,986.01

It will be observed that each year shows a substantial increase in the net interest income.

EXHIBIT D.

Post Office Department.

Officials of the United States Post Office Department—1775 to 1918.

Years.	Presidents.	Postmasters General.	First Assistant Postmasters General.	Second Assistant Postmasters General.	Third Assistant Postmasters General.	Fourth Assistant Postmasters General.
1775	Continental Congress.....	Benjamin Franklin, July 26, 1775.				
1776		Richard Bache, Pa., Nov. 7				
1782		Ebenezer Hazard, N. Y., Jan. 28.	James Bryson, Jan. 28.			
1789	George Washington, Va., Apr. 30.	Samuel Osgood, Mass., Sept. 26.	Jonathan Burrall.			
1791		Timothy Pickering, Pa., Aug. 12.	Charles Burrall.			
1793	George Washington, Va., Mar. 4.					
1795		Joseph Habersham, Ga., Feb. 25.				
1797	John Adams, Mass., Mar. 4.		Abraham Bradley, Jr., Conn.			
1800						
1801	Thomas Jefferson, Va., Mar. 4.	Gideon Granger, Conn., Nov. 28.				
1805	Thomas Jefferson, Va., Mar. 4.					
1809	James Madison, Va., Mar. 4.			Seth Pease, Conn. ¹		
1810						
1813	James Madison, Va., Mar. 4.					
1814		Return J. Meigs, Jr., Ohio, Apr. 11.				
1817	James Monroe, Va., Mar. 4.			Phineas Bradley, Conn.		
1818						
1821	James Monroe, Va., Mar. 6.					
1823		John McLean, Ohio, July 1.				
1825	John Q. Adams, Mass., Mar. 4.					
1829	Andrew Jackson, Tenn., Mar. 4.	William T. Barry, Ky., Apr. 6.	Selah R. Hobbie, N. Y.	Charles K. Gardner, N. J.		
1833	Andrew Jackson, Tenn., Mar. 4.					
1835		Amos Kendall, Ky., May 1.				
1836				Robt. Johnstone.	Daniel Coleman, N. C. ²	
1837	Martin Van Buren, N. Y., Mar. 4.					
1840		John M. Niles, Conn., May 26.				
1841	(William Henry Harrison) Ohio, Mar. 4. John Tyler, Va., Apr. 6....	(Francis Granger, N. Y., Mar. 8. Charles A. Wickliffe, Ky., Oct. 13.)		Philo C. Fuller, N. Y.		
1842				J. W. Tyson.	John S. Skinner, Md.	
1843				N. M. Miller, Va.		
1844				W. Medill, Ohio, and Wm. J. Brown, Ind.	N. M. Miller, Va.	
1845	James K. Polk, Tenn., Mar. 4.	Cave Johnson, Tenn., Mar. 7.			John Marron, Ga.	
1846						

¹Office of Second Assistant Postmaster General created by act of Apr. 30, 1810.²Office of Third Assistant Postmaster General created by act of July 2, 1836.

Post Office Department—Continued.

Years.	Presidents.	Officials of the United States Post Office Department—1775 to 1913.				
		Postmasters General.	First Assistant Postmasters General.	Second Assistant Postmasters General.	Third Assistant Postmasters General.	Fourth Assistant Postmasters General.
1849	Zachary Taylor, Va., Mar. 5.	Jacob Collamer, Vt., Mar. 8.		Fitz Henry Warren, Iowa.		
1850	Millard Fillmore, N. Y., July 9.	Nathan K. Hall, N. Y., July 23.				
1851			S. D. Jacobs, Tenn.			
1852		Samuel D. Hubbard, Conn., Sept. 14.		W. H. Dundas, Va.		
1853	Franklin Pierce, N. H., Mar. 4.	James Campbell, Pa., Mar. 8.	Selah R. Hobbie.			
1854			Horatio King, Me.			
1857	James Buchanan, Pa., Mar. 4.	Aaron V. Brown, Tenn., Mar. 7.				
1859		Joseph Holt, Ky., Mar. 14.			A. N. Zevely, N. C.	
1861	Abraham Lincoln, Ill., Mar. 4.	Horatio King, Me., Feb. 12.	John A. Kasson, Iowa.	Geo. W. McLellan, Mass.		
1863		Montgomery Blair, D. C., Mar. 9.	Alexander W. Randall, Wis.			
1864		William Dennison, Ohio, Oct. 1.				
1865	Abraham Lincoln, Ill., Mar. 4.					
1866	Andrew Johnson, Tenn., Apr. 15.	Alexander W. Randall, Wis., July 25.	St. John B. L. Skinner, N. Y.			
1869	Ulysses S. Grant, Ill., Mar. 4.	John A. J. Creswell, Md., Mar. 6.	Geo. Earle, Md.; Jas. W. Marshall, N. J.	Giles A. Smith, Ill.	W. H. H. Terrell, Ind.	
1871				John L. Rountt, Ill.		
1873	Ulysses S. Grant, Ill., Mar. 4.			E. W. Barber, Mich.		
1874		Jas. W. Marshall, N. J., July 7.	Jas. H. Marr, Md.			
1875		Marshall Jewell, Conn., Sept. 1.	Jas. W. Marshall, N. J.			
1876		James N. Tyner, Ind., July 13.		James N. Tyner, Ind.		
1877	Rutherford B. Hayes, Ohio, Mar. 5.	David McK. Key, Tenn., Mar. 13.	James N. Tyner, Ind.	Thos. J. Brady, Ind.		
1880		Horace Maynard, Tenn., Aug. 25.			Abraham D. Hazen, Pa.	
1881	James A. Garfield, Ohio, Mar. 4.	Thomas L. James, N. Y., Mar. 8.	Frank Hatton, Iowa, Oct. 29.	Richard A. Elmer, N. Y.		
1882	Chester A. Arthur, N. Y., Sept. 20.	Timothy O. Howe, Wis., Jan. 5.				
1883		Walter Q. Gresham, Ind., Apr. 11.		Henry D. Lyman, N. Y.		
1884		Frank Hatton, Iowa, Oct. 14.		W. B. Thompson, Mich.		
1885	Grover Cleveland, N. Y., Mar. 4.	Wm. F. Vilas, Wis., Mar. 7.	John Schuyler Crosby, N. Y.	A. Leo Knott, Md.		
1886			Milton Hay, Pa.			
1887			A. E. Stevenson, Ill.		Henry R. Harris, Ga., Apr. 1.	
1888		Don M. Dickinson, Mich., Jan. 17.				
1889	Benjamin Harrison, Ind., Mar. 4.	John Wanamaker, Pa., Mar. 6.	J. S. Clarkson, Iowa, Mar. 14.	S. A. Whitfield, Ohio, Mar. 18.	A. D. Hazen, Pa., Mar. 18.	
1890			S. A. Whitfield, Ohio, Sept. 29.	J. Lowrie Bell, Pa., Sept. 29.		
1891						E. G. Rathbone, Ohio. ¹
1893	Grover Cleveland, N. Y., Mar. 4.	Wilson S. Bissell, N. Y., Mar. 7.	H. Clay Evans, Tenn., Jan. 7.		Kerr Craigie, N. C., May 19.	R. A. Maxwell, N. Y., Mar. 22.
1894			Frank H. Jones, Ill., May 10.			
1895		William L. Wilson, W. Va., Apr. 4.		Chas. Neilson, Md., June 4.		
1897	William McKinley, Ohio, Mar. 5.	James A. Gary, Md., Mar. 6.	Perry S. Heath, Ind., Mar. 17.	W. S. Shallenberger, Pa., Apr. 5.	John A. Merritt, N. Y., Apr. 29.	J. L. Bristow, Kans., Apr. 1.
1898		Charles Emory Smith, Pa., Apr. 22.				
1899					Edwin C. Madden, Mich., July 1.	
1900			William M. Johnson, N. J., Aug. 23.			
1901	William McKinley, Ohio, Mar. 4.					
1902	Theodore Roosevelt, N. Y., Sept. 14.					
1904		Henry C. Payne, Wis., Jan. 15.	Robert J. Wynne, Pa., Apr. 17.			
1905		Robert J. Wynne, Pa., Oct. 10.				
1907	Theodore Roosevelt, N. Y., Mar. 4.	Geo. B. Cortelyou, N. Y., Mar. 7.	Frank H. Hitchcock, Mass., Mar. 16.			P. V. DeGraw, Pa., Mar. 20.
1908		Geo. von L. Meyer, Mass., Mar. 4.		Jas. T. McCleary, Minn., Mar. 29.	Abraham L. Lawshe, Ind., Mar. 22.	
1909	William H. Taft, Ohio, Mar. 4.		Chas. P. Grandfield, Mo., Feb. 29.	Jos. Stewart, Mo., Sept. 29.		
1910		Frank H. Hitchcock, Mass., Mar. 6.				
1911					James J. Britt, N. C., Dec. 1.	
1913	Woodrow Wilson, N. J., Mar. 4.	Albert S. Burleson, Tex., Mar. 5.	Daniel C. Roper, S. C., Mar. 14.		Alexander M. Dockery, Mo., Mar. 17.	James I. Blakslee, Pa., Mar. 17.
1915				Otto Praeger, Tex., Sept. 1.		

¹ Office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General created by act of Mar. 3, 1891.

Postal statistics of the United States—From 1789 to 1918 by fiscal years.

Years.	Number of post offices.	Extent of post routes, in miles.	Miles of mail service performed.	Gross revenue of department.	Gross expenditure of department.	Paid as compensation of postmasters.	Ordinary postage stamps issued.	Stamped envelopes and wrappers issued.
1789	75			\$7,510	\$7,560	\$1,657		
1790	75	1,875		37,935	32,140	8,198		
1791	89	1,905		46,294	36,697	10,312		
1792	195	5,642		67,443	54,530	16,517		
1793	209	5,642	845,468	104,746	72,039	21,645		
1794	450	11,984		128,947	89,972	27,155		
1795	453	13,207		160,620	117,893	30,272		
1796	468	13,207		195,066	131,571	35,729		
1797	554	16,180	1,799,720	213,908	150,114	47,109		
1798	639	16,180		232,977	179,084	56,035		
1799	677	16,180	1,900,000	264,846	188,037	63,957		
1800	903	20,817		280,804	218,994	69,242		
1801	1,025	22,309	3,057,964	320,442	255,151	79,337		
1802	1,114	25,315		327,044	281,916	85,686		
1803	1,258	25,315	3,504,800	351,822	322,364	93,169		
1804	1,405	29,556		389,449	337,502	107,715		
1805	1,558	31,076		421,373	377,367	111,551		
1806	1,710	33,431		446,105	417,233	119,784		
1807	1,848	33,755	4,449,456	478,762	453,885	129,041		
1808	1,944	34,035		460,564	462,828	128,653		
1809	2,012	34,035		506,633	498,012	141,579		
1810	2,300	36,406	5,592,652	551,634	495,969	149,438		
1811	2,463	36,406		587,246	499,098	159,244		
1812	2,610	39,378		649,203	540,165	177,422		
1813	2,708	39,540		703,154	681,011	221,848		
1814	2,670	41,736		730,370	727,126	234,354		
1815	3,000	43,966	7,509,224	1,043,065	748,121	241,901		
1816	3,260	48,976		961,782	801,022	265,544		
1817	3,459	51,600		1,002,973	916,615	303,916		
1818	3,618	59,473		1,130,235	1,035,832	346,429		
1819	4,000	67,586		1,204,737	1,117,861	375,828		
1820	4,500	72,492		1,111,927	1,160,926	352,295		
1821	4,650	78,808		1,059,087	1,165,481	337,599		
1822	4,709	82,763		1,117,490	1,167,572	355,299		
1823	4,043	81,880	10,169,240	1,130,115	1,159,995	360,462		
1824	5,182	81,896	10,595,358	1,197,758	1,188,019	383,801		
1825	5,677	91,052	11,629,031	1,303,525	1,229,043	411,183		
1826	6,150	94,052	11,957,585	1,447,703	1,385,712	447,727		
1827	7,300	105,336	12,872,831	1,521,633	1,469,959	483,411		
1828	7,530	105,336	13,703,089	1,659,915	1,689,945	548,049		
1829	8,004	115,000	13,703,000	1,707,418	1,782,132	559,237		
1830	8,450	115,176	14,500,000	1,850,583	1,932,708	595,234		
1831	8,686	115,486	15,468,692	1,997,811	1,936,122	635,028		
1832	9,205	101,466	23,625,021	2,258,570	2,236,171	715,481		
1833	10,127	119,916	23,854,485	2,617,011	2,030,414	823,283		
1834	10,693	119,916	25,503,000	2,823,749	2,910,605	897,317		
1835	10,770	112,774	25,889,485	2,993,556	2,757,350	945,418		
1836	11,091	118,264	27,578,620	3,408,323	2,841,766	812,803		
1837	11,767	141,242	32,597,005	4,945,668	3,288,319	891,352		
1838	12,519	134,818	34,582,202	4,238,733	4,430,662	933,948		
1839	12,780	133,999	34,496,878	4,484,657	4,636,536	980,000		
1840	13,468	155,739	36,370,776	4,543,522	4,718,236	1,028,925		
1841	13,778	155,025	34,993,525	4,407,723	4,499,528	1,018,654		
1842	13,733	149,732	34,835,991	4,546,849	5,674,752	1,147,256		
1843	13,814	142,295	35,232,805	4,296,225	4,374,751	1,426,394		
1844	14,103	144,687	35,409,624	4,237,288	4,296,513	1,358,316		
1845	14,183	143,940	35,634,269	4,280,841	4,320,732	1,409,875		
1846	14,601	152,865	37,398,414	3,487,199	4,076,036	1,042,070		
1847	15,146	153,818	38,887,899	3,880,309	3,979,542	1,060,228		
1848	16,159	163,208	41,012,579	4,555,211	4,326,850	1,254,345	\$ 860,380	
1849	16,749	167,703	42,544,089	4,705,176	4,479,049	1,320,921	955,727	
1850	18,417	178,672	46,541,423	5,499,984	5,212,953	1,549,376	1,540,545	
1851	19,796	196,290	53,465,724	6,410,604	6,278,402	1,781,686	1,246,548	
1852	20,901	214,284	58,985,728	5,184,526	7,108,450	1,296,765	54,136,319	
1853	22,320	217,743	61,892,542	5,240,725	7,982,757	1,406,477		\$ 5,000,000
1854	23,548	219,935	63,387,005	6,255,586	8,577,424	1,707,708	56,330,000	21,384,100
1855	24,410	227,908	67,401,166	6,642,136	9,968,342	2,135,335	72,977,300	23,451,725
1856	25,565	239,642	71,307,897	6,920,822	10,405,286	2,102,891	126,045,210	33,761,050
1857	26,586	242,601	74,906,067	7,353,951	11,508,058	2,285,610	154,729,465	33,033,400
1858	27,977	260,603	78,765,491	7,486,793	12,722,470	2,355,016	176,761,835	30,971,375
1859	28,539	260,032	82,308,402	7,968,484	11,458,083	2,453,901	192,201,920	30,280,025
1860	28,498	240,591	74,724,776	8,518,067	19,170,610	2,552,868	216,370,660	29,280,025
1861	28,586	140,399	54,455,454	8,349,296	13,606,759	2,514,157	211,788,518	26,027,300
1862	28,875	134,013	53,432,525	8,299,821	11,125,364	2,340,767	231,307,105	27,234,150
1863	29,047	139,598	56,226,015	11,163,790	11,314,207	2,876,983	338,340,385	25,548,750
1864	28,878	139,172	56,315,357	12,438,254	12,644,786	3,174,326	334,034,610	28,218,800
1865	20,550	142,340	57,993,494	14,556,159	13,694,728	3,383,382	387,419,455	26,206,175
1866	23,828	180,921	71,837,914	14,436,986	15,352,079	3,451,677	347,734,325	39,094,725
1867	25,163	203,215	78,982,789	15,297,027	19,235,483	4,033,728	371,599,605	63,086,650
1868	26,481	216,928	84,221,325	16,292,601	22,730,593	4,255,311	383,470,500	73,364,650
1869	27,106	223,731	90,723,403	18,344,511	23,698,131	4,546,958	421,047,469	81,675,100
1870	28,492	231,232	97,021,996	19,772,221	23,998,837	4,673,466	468,118,445	86,289,500
1871	30,045	238,359	107,572,794	20,037,045	24,390,104	5,028,381	498,126,175	104,675,275
1872	31,863	251,398	114,981,322	21,915,426	26,638,192	5,121,665	541,445,070	113,925,750
1873	33,244	256,210	119,903,650	22,906,742	29,081,946	5,725,468	601,931,520	131,172,600
1874	34,294	269,097	128,627,476	26,471,072	32,126,415	5,818,472	632,733,420	136,418,500
1875	35,547	277,873	133,822,216	26,791,360	33,611,309	7,049,936	682,342,470	149,766,400
1876	36,383	281,798	136,269,708	28,644,193	33,263,488	7,331,460	698,799,090	165,520,250
1877	37,345	292,820	147,353,251	27,631,585	33,486,322	7,234,283	689,580,670	170,651,450
1878	38,253	301,966	158,185,375	29,277,517	34,165,084	7,966,921	742,461,940	183,560,350
1879	40,588	316,711	167,432,805	30,041,983	33,449,899	7,182,239	774,358,780	177,661,950
1880	42,939	343,888	178,236,993	36,315,479	36,542,804	7,703,407	875,681,970	207,137,000
1881	44,512	344,006	188,125,032	38,785,393	39,592,566	8,298,743	954,128,450	227,067,050
1882	46,231	343,618	194,901,703	41,876,410	40,482,021	8,964,676	1,114,560,330	256,565,450
1883	46,820	353,166	211,260,301	45,808,693	43,282,944	10,315,394	1,202,743,800	259,266,450
1884	48,434	359,539	227,632,732	43,325,959	47,224,560	11,283,530	1,459,768,460	322,232,050
1885	51,252	365,251	238,478,773	42,560,844	50,046,235	11,243,848	1,465,122,935	322,751,400
1886	53,614	368,069	252,044,705	45,948,423	51,004,744	11,348,178	1,620,784,100	354,008,100
1887	55,157	392,874	270,173,065	45,837,609	53,095,194	11,629,481	1,746,985,520	381,611,300
1888	57,376	403,976	287,251,035	52,695,176	56,468,315	12,589,768	1,867,173,140	433,635,700
1889	58,999	416,159	310,901,884	56,175,611	62,317,119	13,168,991	1,961,980,840	451,864,300
1890	62,401	427,993	327,409,493	60,882,098	66,259,548	13,753,096	2,219,737,060	513,832,950

* For 3 months only.

* Postage stamps first issued under act of Mar. 3, 1847, and placed on sale at New York, N. Y., July 1, 1847.

* Stamped envelopes first issued June, 1853, under act of Aug. 30, 1852.

* Newspaper wrappers first issued under act of Feb. 27, 1861.

* Special-request envelopes first issued in 1895.

Postal statistics of the United States—From 1789 to 1918 by fiscal years—Continued.

Years.	Number of post offices.	Extent of post routes, in miles.	Miles of mail service performed.	Gross revenue of department.	Gross expenditure of department.	Paid as compensation of postmasters.	Ordinary postage stamps issued.	Stamped envelopes and wrappers issued.
1891.	64,329	439,027	346,266,445	\$65,931,786	\$73,059,519	\$14,527,000	2,397,03,340	556,226,250
1892.	67,119	447,591	363,087,605	70,930,475	76,980,846	15,249,565	2,543,270,210	593,684,700
1893.	68,403	453,833	381,499,086	75,806,993	81,581,681	15,363,622	2,750,293,090	636,279,436
1894.	69,805	454,746	396,809,866	75,080,479	84,994,112	15,899,709	2,602,278,355	571,475,218
1895.	70,064	456,026	402,676,059	76,983,128	87,179,551	16,079,508	2,795,424,808	598,848,900
1896.	70,390	453,313	401,388,424	82,479,208	90,932,699	16,511,181	3,025,481,477	618,040,250
1897.	71,722	471,032	421,851,479	82,665,452	94,077,242	16,908,384	3,093,633,585	585,092,000
1898.	73,571	481,441	434,332,691	89,012,418	98,033,523	17,453,433	3,418,458,390	606,447,000
1899.	75,710	493,948	445,744,845	96,021,384	101,632,160	18,223,501	3,692,775,815	628,453,000
1900.	76,888	500,989	453,205,773	102,354,579	107,740,277	19,112,097	3,993,544,574	707,555,000
1901.	76,945	511,808	466,146,039	111,631,193	115,554,921	19,949,515	4,239,273,696	772,839,000
1902.	76,924	507,540	474,234,687	121,848,047	124,785,697	20,783,919	4,621,285,723	843,128,000
1903.	74,169	503,268	493,193,359	134,224,443	138,784,487	21,631,724	5,270,549,115	948,654,000
1904.	71,131	496,818	503,585,526	143,582,624	152,362,116	22,273,343	5,339,886,845	1,020,255,250
1905.	68,131	489,805	510,603,514	157,826,585	167,399,169	22,743,342	5,751,017,915	1,074,918,000
1906.	65,900	478,711	515,185,591	167,932,782	178,449,778	23,544,585	6,284,459,495	1,230,287,750
1907.	67,459	463,406	524,725,747	183,585,005	190,238,288	24,575,696	7,061,036,615	1,478,840,250
1908.	60,704	450,738	538,438,722	191,478,663	208,351,888	25,579,397	7,651,400,405	1,266,002,559
1909.	60,144	448,618	512,151,121	203,592,383	221,004,102	26,579,892	8,731,875,393	1,509,626,246
1910.	59,580	447,998	553,312,998	224,178,957	229,977,224	27,571,013	9,067,164,888	1,593,861,593
1911.	59,237	435,488	549,077,849	237,879,873	237,648,926	28,782,450	10,046,098,778	1,690,775,385
1912.	58,729	436,499	578,165,266	246,744,015	248,525,450	28,647,726	9,929,173,748	1,684,624,161
1913.	58,010	436,293	590,178,461	265,619,575	262,037,541	29,126,662	10,812,507,738	1,724,739,140
1914.	57,810	435,597	600,100,663	287,934,555	283,543,769	29,968,515	11,112,254,281	1,864,713,929
1915.	57,380	433,334	616,490,121	287,248,165	298,545,075	29,143,127	11,229,383,415	1,793,764,296
1916.	55,734	425,950	617,745,353	312,057,689	301,204,033	31,135,234	11,671,842,200	1,853,791,461
1917.	55,413	454,835	668,930,441	329,726,116	319,838,718	31,945,104	12,451,522,177	2,161,108,013
1918.	54,345	465,371	624,731,038	388,975,932	324,833,728	31,420,536	13,035,784,852	1,819,307,148

Years.	Postal cards issued.	Registered and insured mail (pieces).	Dead letters received.	Amount received from dead letters.	Number of money-order offices in operation.	Amount of domestic money orders issued.	Amount of international money orders issued.	Number of pieces of matter of all kinds handled (estimated).
1789.								
1790.								
1791.								
1792.								
1793.								
1794.								
1795.								
1796.								
1797.								
1798.								
1799.								
1800.								
1801.								
1802.								
1803.								
1804.								
1805.								
1806.								
1807.								
1808.								
1809.								
1810.								
1811.								
1812.								
1813.								
1814.								
1815.								
1816.								
1817.								
1818.								
1819.								
1820.								
1821.								
1822.								
1823.								
1824.								
1825.								
1826.								
1827.								
1828.								
1829.								
1830.								
1831.				1,380,000				
1832.				1,500,000				
1833.								
1834.								
1835.								
1836.								
1837.				900,000				
1838.					2,12,000			
1839.								
1840.								
1841.								
1842.								
1843.					2,668			
1844.					20			
1845.					1,192			
1846.					1,824			
1847.				1,800,000	187			121,173,489
1848.					1,296			
1849.				2,100,000	99			
1850.					1,748			
1851.				2,750,000	1,675			
1852.					8,235			
1853.					1,384			
1854.					4,346			
1855.					4,976			
1856.					8,383			

1 Letters returned to writers.

2 Aggregate accumulation from 1789 to 1838.

3 Letters first registered July 1, 1855, under act of Mar. 3, 1855.

Postal statistics of the United States—From 1788 to 1918 by fiscal years—Continued.

Years.	Postal cards issued.	Registered and insured mail (pieces).	Dead letters received.	Amount received from dead letters.	Number of money-order offices in operation.	Amount of domestic money orders issued.	Amount of international money orders issued.	Number of pieces of matter of all kinds handled (estimated).
1857		717,537		\$6,756				
1858		562,903		3,410				
1859		501,059	2,500,000	3,134				
1860		500,774	2,000,000	3,803				
1861		386,113	2,550,000					
1862		302,987	2,282,018	1,052				
1863		372,893	2,550,416					
1864		259,798	3,508,825					
1865		282,533	4,368,087	5,222	419	\$1,360,122		
1866		275,103	5,198,605	15,393	766	3,977,259		
1867		249,075	4,306,508	17,485	1,224	9,229,327		
1868			4,162,144	30,502	1,468	16,197,858		
1869			3,952,862	8,818	1,466	24,848,058		
1870			4,152,460	8,023	1,694	34,054,181	\$22,189	
1871			4,194,748	10,596	2,076	42,164,118	38,489	
1872			4,241,374	7,299	2,452	48,515,532	833,000	
1873	\$1,094,000		4,402,348	6,205	2,775	57,516,216	1,863,512	
1874	91,079,000		4,601,773	8,721	3,069	74,424,854	2,265,242	
1875	107,616,000		3,628,808	9,180	3,404	77,431,251	1,964,574	
1876	150,815,000	4,007,817	3,542,464	9,889	3,401	77,035,972	2,068,688	
1877	170,015,500	4,348,137	3,288,290	4,945	3,697	72,820,509	1,844,033	
1878	200,620,000	4,898,804	3,186,805	8,937	4,143	81,442,364	2,047,693	
1879	221,797,000	5,429,022	2,998,513	3,323	4,512	88,254,641	2,240,454	
1880	272,550,500	6,996,513	3,057,141	6,503	4,829	100,352,818	3,463,892	
1881	308,536,500	8,338,918	3,323,621	6,584	5,163	105,075,769	4,683,926	
1882	351,493,000	9,627,922	4,160,554	7,637	5,491	113,403,118	6,536,514	
1883	379,516,750	10,594,716	4,379,398	12,279	6,927	117,329,406	7,717,832	
1884	362,876,750	11,246,545	4,564,451	9,619	6,310	122,121,251	7,688,776	
1885	339,416,500	11,043,256	4,710,240	12,097	7,056	117,858,921	6,840,358	
1886	355,648,000	11,648,227	4,791,698	8,858	7,357	113,819,521	7,178,738	
1887	356,939,250	12,524,421	5,335,363	10,976	7,853	117,462,660	9,035,530	3,474,000,000
1888	381,797,500	13,677,169	6,217,876	10,535	8,241	119,649,064	11,293,870	3,495,100,000
1889	386,808,500	14,061,896	6,206,893	12,103	8,727	115,081,845	12,280,516	3,575,100,000
1890	429,515,350	14,947,081	6,517,556	12,050	9,382	114,362,757	13,230,135	3,860,200,000
1891	424,216,750	15,047,602	6,829,460	13,860	10,070	119,122,236	14,443,667	4,005,408,206
1892	511,433,500	15,281,094	6,780,980	15,929	12,069	120,056,801	15,120,271	4,369,900,352
1893	530,505,600	15,561,410	7,131,027	13,895	18,434	127,576,433	16,341,838	4,776,575,076
1894	468,499,750	15,053,554	7,101,044	14,940	19,264	138,793,579	13,792,455	5,021,841,056
1895	492,305,550	14,428,081	6,319,873	12,219	19,691	156,709,089	12,906,488	5,019,090,000
1896	524,820,150	15,106,336	6,253,363	11,957	20,802	172,100,649	13,852,615	5,134,281,200
1897	523,608,250	14,559,083	5,976,960	11,454	21,082	174,482,676	13,588,379	5,603,719,192
1898	556,380,650	15,600,220	6,295,853	10,527	23,421	191,354,121	13,239,769	5,781,002,143
1899	573,634,150	16,086,022	6,855,983	13,115	26,784	211,213,592	13,744,770	6,214,447,000
1900	587,815,250	18,422,649	7,536,158	14,465	29,649	238,921,009	16,749,018	6,576,310,000
1901	659,614,800	20,814,501	8,507,257	15,635	30,529	274,546,067	20,072,614	7,129,990,202
1902	547,204,090	22,831,400	9,300,351	18,459	31,680	313,551,279	22,974,473	7,424,390,329
1903	770,657,950	25,951,178	10,153,528	20,961	34,547	353,627,648	35,237,935	8,085,446,853
1904	702,907,450	28,213,870	10,923,239	22,210	35,094	378,778,488	42,550,150	8,887,467,048
1905	728,285,100	30,200,177	10,973,361	23,787	36,832	396,903,433	47,516,027	9,502,459,635
1906	798,917,850	34,165,484	11,663,377	24,080	37,444	444,515,790	63,047,863	10,187,505,889
1907	805,568,700	38,255,649	13,005,255	26,056	37,572	479,650,342	84,080,711	10,361,090,610
1908	809,426,750	40,151,797	13,145,172	36,644	43,313	498,699,637	88,972,388	12,255,666,367
1909	926,478,900	40,539,545	11,997,325	28,913	50,043	491,074,844	76,754,802	13,364,068,923
1910	726,441,000	42,053,574	12,545,133	30,785	51,791	547,993,641	99,742,686	14,004,577,271
1911	975,138,748	42,768,459	13,614,416	32,854	51,809	578,111,005	109,604,639	14,850,102,559
1912	909,411,045	42,235,000	13,268,199	33,122	52,815	583,337,003	97,660,024	16,900,552,138
1913	946,861,679	43,489,172	13,214,346	31,143	54,594	624,489,096	102,668,288	17,588,658,941
1914	962,072,326	56,397,194	12,082,342	39,077	55,055	667,231,064	101,963,428	18,567,445,160
1915	975,542,228	60,042,590	10,781,927	38,514	55,670	654,139,134	60,772,073	
1916	1,047,894,800	70,473,197	10,839,890	45,856	56,026	719,364,950	46,357,386	
1917	1,112,337,760	84,117,774	13,614,927	57,938	56,079	813,318,927	41,644,878	
1918	707,111,300	109,070,762	14,451,953	71,709	55,668	914,575,255	25,938,964	

¹ From Nov. 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895. Money-order system went into operation Nov. 1, 1864, under act of Congress of May 17, 1864.

² From Sept. 1, 1899, to June 30, 1870. International money orders first issued under convention of Oct. 12, 1867.

³ Postal cards first issued May 1, 1873, under act of June 8, 1872.

⁴ Insurance service inaugurated Jan. 1, 1913, under act of Congress Aug. 24, 1912.

Years.	City Delivery Service. ¹			Rural Delivery Service. ²			Special Delivery Service. ³
	Number of city delivery offices.	Number of carriers.	Annual cost of service.	Carriers.	Mileage.	Annual cost.	Number of pieces delivered.
1864	66	685	\$317,063				
1865	45	757	448,664				
1866	46	863	589,236				
1867	47	943	699,934				
1868	48	1,198	995,934				
1869	48	1,246	1,183,915				
1870	51	1,362	1,230,079				
1871	52	1,419	1,353,923				
1872	52	1,443	1,383,965				
1873	52	1,498	1,422,495				
1874	57	2,049	1,812,695				
1875	57	2,195	1,880,041				
1876	57	2,269	1,981,183				
1877	57	2,265	1,893,619				
1878	57	2,275	1,824,166				
1879	88	2,359	1,947,703				
1880	104	2,628	2,363,693				
1881	109	2,861	2,499,911				
1882	112	3,115	2,623,262				

¹ Free City Delivery Service authorized by act of Mar. 3, 1863. Established July 1, 1863.

² The first experimental Rural Delivery Service was established on Oct. 1, 1896, simultaneously on three routes, from Charlestown, Uvilla, and Halltown, W. Va.

³ Special Delivery Service authorized by act of Mar. 3, 1885. Established Oct. 1, 1885. Service restricted to delivery of letters at a free-delivery office or in an town of 4,000 or more inhabitants. Aug. 4, 1883, extended to provide for the immediate delivery of mail matter at all free-delivery offices and within 1 mile of every other office.

Postal statistics of the United States—From 1789 to 1918 by fiscal years—Continued.

Year.	City Delivery Service. ¹			Rural Delivery Service. ²			Special Delivery Service. ³
	Number of city delivery offices.	Number of carriers.	Annual cost of service.	Carriers.	Mileage.	Annual cost.	Number of pieces delivered.
1883	154	3,680	\$3,173,335				
1884	159	3,870	3,504,275				
1885	178	4,358	3,985,952				
1886	181	4,841	4,312,375				1,835,334
1887	189	5,310	4,618,692				1,024,557
1888	358	6,345	5,422,356				1,223,237
1889	401	8,257	6,957,941				1,378,647
1890	454	9,063	7,975,202				1,613,567
1891	519	10,139	9,072,160				1,972,195
1892	568	10,737	9,956,892				2,393,684
1893	610	11,625	10,683,575				2,899,370
1894	610	11,795	11,229,435				2,899,970
1895	604	12,714	12,135,544				3,081,035
1896	627	12,834	12,713,861				3,475,377
1897	629	12,931	12,827,395	483	1,843	\$14,810	3,629,831
1898	688	13,696	13,357,576	148	2,990	57,241	4,092,675
1899	735	14,255	13,975,870	391	8,929	157,012	4,551,672
1900	799	15,322	14,512,197	1,270	28,685	423,433	5,191,594
1901	865	16,389	15,752,607	4,301	100,293	1,753,321	5,873,517
1902	933	17,787	17,123,310	8,403	186,252	4,089,011	6,788,221
1903	1,032	19,542	19,337,955	15,119	332,618	8,051,593	8,959,593
1904	1,100	20,758	20,531,275	24,593	552,725	12,645,275	9,888,457
1905	1,144	21,778	20,919,078	32,055	721,237	20,851,835	10,593,635
1906	1,184	22,955	21,987,632	35,063	820,318	25,011,625	11,082,333
1907	1,240	24,577	23,170,233	37,582	883,117	26,061,555	12,893,319
1908	1,330	25,352	25,255,039	39,143	931,087	34,371,939	13,734,514
1909	1,440	27,620	29,738,131	40,499	979,624	35,661,031	13,911,108
1910	1,432	28,715	31,683,571	40,997	993,068	36,914,769	15,440,033
1911	1,541	29,168	32,970,451	41,530	1,037,772	37,123,812	16,756,479
1912	1,621	29,962	34,152,517	42,081	1,021,432	41,552,422	18,366,377
1913	1,675	30,923	36,670,544	42,685	1,038,076	45,655,533	20,811,564
1914	1,759	32,232	40,548,621	45,534	1,063,679	47,377,071	22,484,192
1915	1,838	32,902	42,038,876	45,718	1,073,090	49,825,003	23,483,265
1916	1,846	34,114	43,138,818	42,766	1,037,253	51,952,326	27,530,268
1917	1,948	34,592	48,047,712	43,338	1,112,566	52,423,011	33,913,650
1918	1,992	34,533	49,995,450	43,338	1,127,110	52,135,818	46,987,375

¹ Free City Delivery Service authorized by act of Mar. 3, 1883. Established July 1, 1883.² The first experimental Rural Delivery Service was established on Oct. 1, 1896, simultaneously on three routes, from Charlestown, Uvilla, and Halltown, W. Va.³ Special Delivery Service authorized by act of Mar. 3, 1885. Established Oct. 1, 1885. Service restricted to delivery of letters at any free-delivery office or in any town of 4,000 or more inhabitants. Aug. 2, 1886, extended to provide for the immediate delivery of mail matter at all free-delivery offices and within 1 mile of every other office.⁴ For 9 months only.Postal savings system.¹

Years	Total depositors.	Number of depositors.	Amount to credit of depositors.
1911 ²	400	11,918	\$677,145
1912	10,170	243,801	20,237,084
1913	12,820	331,005	33,818,870
1914	10,347	388,511	43,444,271
1915	9,546	525,414	65,684,708
1916	8,421	602,937	86,019,885
1917	7,161	674,728	131,954,696
1918	6,678	612,188	148,471,499

¹ Postal savings system inaugurated Jan. 3, 1911, under act of June 25, 1910.² For 6 months only.

IMPROVEMENTS AND EXTENSIONS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE SINCE MARCH 4, 1913.

JUNE 30, 1919.

May 7, 1913: Order promulgating regulations requiring all postmasters of the fourth class to qualify for office through civil-service examinations.

July 1, 1913: Inauguration of C. O. D. feature of parcel-post mail.

July 1, 1913: At the inauguration January 1, 1913, of the service providing for the indemnification of shippers of fourth-class domestic mail a flat fee of 10 cents was charged, which insured an article against loss for its actual value not exceeding \$50 in any case. Effective July 1, 1913, another rate was introduced which provided for the insurance of an article against loss for its actual value, not exceeding \$25 in any case, upon payment of a fee of 5 cents.

July 1, 1913: Distinctive parcel-post stamp discontinued.

1913: During the year provision was made whereby sender of a parcel may attach a communication to it on condition that necessary stamps for first-class rate of postage were affixed. This permits simultaneous delivery of communication and parcel.

October 1, 1914: Inauguration of Government-owned motor-vehicle service in the large cities, superseding the contract and screen-wagon service in cities.

1914: Reorganization and standardization of post-office methods and reorganization of large offices so as to operate on a two-division plan—finances and handling of mail—permitting a flexible and compact force and increasing the efficiency of the service.

July 1, 1915: Advancement of fourth-class post offices to presidential grade where compensation of \$1,000 for the year, eliminating the requirement that it must be \$250 each quarter.

July 28, 1916: Compensatory time for holiday service to be given on one of the following 30 days. (Amended to include laborers, special clerks, etc.)

August 8, 1916: Regulations promulgated providing for the payment of indemnity for injury to insured mail, in accordance with the

provisions of the Postal Service appropriation. Act approved July 28, 1916.

August 8, 1916: Regulations promulgated providing for a minimum 3-cent fee for insurance in an amount not exceeding \$5 valuation. The popularity of this feature is evidenced by the fact that 58 per cent of all packages insured are at this rate.

August 8, 1916: Regulations promulgated providing for the maximum amount of \$100 insurance on the payment of a fee of 25 cents.

March 31, 1917: Reappointment of postmasters at presidential post offices based solely on their record, and where the record of the incumbent in office requires a new appointment the creation of an eligible register through civil-service examination.

1917: Establishment of military branch post offices.

June 30, 1918: Discontinuance of pneumatic-tube service.

July 1, 1918: Discontinuance of insurance tag.

July 2, 1918: Reinstatement provided by law for all who enter military service to the salary to which they would have been automatically promoted had they remained in the Postal Service.

July 2, 1918: Modification of postal-savings law to permit deposits up to \$2,500.

July 2, 1918: Compensation in lieu of compensatory time for employees.

July 1, 1918: The postal appropriation act approved February 28, 1919, provides that hereafter all days, other than holidays enumerated in the act of July 28, 1916, making an appropriation for the Postal Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, set aside by the President of the United States as holidays to be observed by other departments of the Government throughout the United States shall be construed as applicable to the Postal Service in the same manner and to the same extent as the executive departments.

PARCEL POST CHANGES.

August 15, 1913: The limit of weight was increased from 11 to 20 pounds and material reductions made in the rates for the first and second zones, as follows:

Pounds.	First zone.			Second zone.		
	Old rate.	New rate.	Reduction.	Old rate.	New rate.	Reduction.
1.....	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.01
2.....	.08	.06	0.02	.10	.06	.04
3.....	.11	.07	.04	.14	.07	.07
4.....	.14	.08	.06	.18	.08	.10
5.....	.17	.09	.08	.22	.09	.13
6.....	.20	.10	.10	.26	.10	.16
7.....	.23	.11	.12	.30	.11	.19
8.....	.26	.12	.14	.34	.12	.22
9.....	.29	.13	.16	.38	.13	.25
10.....	.32	.14	.18	.42	.14	.28
11.....	.35	.15	.20	.46	.15	.31

January 1, 1914: The limit of weight was increased from 20 to 50 pounds and material reductions made in the rates for the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth zones, as follows:

Pounds.	Third zone.			Fourth zone.		
	Old rate.	New rate.	Reduction.	Old rate.	New rate.	Reduction.
1.....	0.07	0.06	0.01	0.08	0.07	0.01
2.....	.12	.08	.04	.14	.11	.03
3.....	.17	.10	.07	.20	.15	.05
4.....	.23	.12	.10	.26	.19	.07
5.....	.27	.14	.13	.32	.23	.09
6.....	.32	.16	.16	.38	.27	.11
7.....	.37	.18	.19	.44	.31	.13
8.....	.42	.20	.22	.50	.35	.15
9.....	.47	.22	.25	.56	.39	.17
10.....	.52	.24	.28	.62	.43	.19
11.....	.57	.26	.31	.68	.47	.21

Pounds.	Fifth zone.			Sixth zone.		
	Old rate.	New rate.	Reduction.	Old rate.	New rate.	Reduction.
1.....	0.09	0.08	0.01	0.10	0.09	0.01
2.....	.16	.14	.02	.19	.17	.02
3.....	.23	.20	.03	.28	.25	.03
4.....	.30	.26	.04	.37	.33	.04
5.....	.37	.32	.05	.46	.41	.05
6.....	.44	.38	.06	.55	.49	.06
7.....	.51	.44	.07	.64	.57	.07
8.....	.58	.50	.08	.73	.65	.08
9.....	.65	.56	.09	.82	.73	.09
10.....	.72	.62	.10	.91	.81	.10
11.....	.79	.68	.11	1.00	.89	.11

March 16, 1914: Books weighing in excess of 8 ounces given parcel-post zone rates. Previous to this the rate was 1 cent for each 2 ounces up to 4 pounds.

April 24, 1914: Seeds, scions, bulbs, cuttings, etc., in excess of 8-ounce packages given parcel-post zone rates.

July 10, 1915: Size of parcel-post packages increased from 72 to 84 inches.

March 15, 1918: Limit of weight increased from 50 to 70 pounds in first, second, and third zones, and from 20 to 50 pounds in remaining zones.

Number of parcels mailed at all post offices.

June 30, 1913.....	331,394,800
June 30, 1914.....	570,444,815
June 30, 1915.....	948,637,896
June 30, 1916.....	1,001,021,616
June 30, 1917.....	1,024,362,744
June 30, 1918.....	1,500,000,000
June 30, 1919.....	2,250,000,000

Extensions of service.

POST OFFICES HAVING CITY DELIVERY SERVICE.

1913.....	1,675
1919.....	2,041

POST OFFICE CLERKS.

1913.....	35,846
1919.....	44,707

CITY LETTER CARRIERS.

1913.....	30,923
1919.....	35,013

During the past six years close cooperation has developed between this department and the Treasury Department in the plan of arrangement and facilities provided in new Federal buildings. As a result each office is now provided with the same relative amount of floor space, based on the estimated number of postal employees 10 years hence; several standard types of screen-line arrangement are in vogue to meet the varying needs of the Postal Service at offices of different sizes; a standard plan of providing vault and toilet facilities has been adopted; and the progress in standardization has so far advanced that at the present time it is possible to use the one set of drawings, with minor modifications, for several buildings.

PNEUMATIC TUBES.

The act of July 13, 1892, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department, authorized the Postmaster General "to examine into the subject of a more rapid dispatch of mail matter between large cities and post-office stations, and transportation terminals located in large cities by means of pneumatic tubes or other systems."

Acting under this authority Postmaster General John Wanamaker, under date of July 26, 1892, issued an advertisement inviting interested parties to submit descriptions of pneumatic tubes "and an offer to submit test." The first pneumatic tube for the transmission of mail was used in Philadelphia in 1893 in an experimental way.

March 1, 1894, the service was formally recognized and paid for by the Post Office Department. Investigation shows that pneumatic tubes had not been a success for commercial purposes. A line of 10-inch tubes about 4½ miles long were laid in Boston for commercial uses, but was not a success, and were subsequently leased to the Post Office Department on November 1, 1906, for the transmission of mail, at a rental of \$17,000 per mile per annum, for a period of 10 years.

From 1897 to 1918, excepting 1902, when Congress failed to appropriate, a total of \$11,752,567.16 had been expended for the use of pneumatic tubes.

In the early days of the pneumatic tubes Hon. W. H. Moody, then a Member of Congress, referred to previous appropriations as "ill begotten," and stated:

"The first appropriation was made when Mr. Neilson was Second Assistant Postmaster General."

"Within six weeks, at the outside, after he left the office, he was given \$1,000 in cash and \$10,000 in stock for his services at Washington during the succeeding year. What they were I do not know. What they could properly be I could not guess, but he was given this stock."

"But that is not all, Mr. Chairman; there was other testimony before the commission. I shall mention no names, and I regret extremely to have to speak upon this subject. But we found that the pneumatic-tube system in New York was constructed by contractors who took their pay in stock and bonds; that the only value which that stock and those bonds had was the contract with the Government. It was certainly unfortunate—I think nothing else, believe nothing else, but unfortunate—it was certainly unfortunate that a holder of the bonds and one of the contractors was a Member of this House and a member of the Committee on Appropriations."

"As showing the methods employed by the New York company, I will state that a large block of the stock of this company, as New Year's present, was sent to a near relative of an important and influential Member of the House. I am glad to say that the return mail was not allowed to depart from Washington without carrying back that dishonoring and dishonorable gift."

The Congress fully recognized the value of the judgment of experienced postal officials in this matter and would not even trust the Postmaster General to pass on the value of the pneumatic-tube service, because he might lack expert and scientific postal knowledge, but required by the act of April 21, 1902—

"That no advertisement shall issue until after a careful investigation shall have been made as to the needs and practicability of such service, and until a favorable report, in writing, shall have been submitted to the Postmaster General by a commission of not less than three expert postal officials to be named by him."

ZONE RATES ON SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

Zone rates on second-class matter were effective July 1, 1918. Based on the amount of mail handled in 1912, it was estimated that the increased revenue in postage under this new law would be substantially as follows:

First year.....	\$4,900,000
Second year.....	9,800,000
Third year.....	15,000,000
Fourth year.....	20,000,000

Prior to the enactment of this law it was estimated that at least \$72,000,000 annually was lost in the handling of second-class matter.

The following have indorsed the zone rates on second-class matter and are in favor of the retention of the present law: National Editorial Association, Missouri Editorial Association, Northwestern Editorial Association, Kansas Editorial Association, and Texas Press Association.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, Washington, June 28, 1919.

The space method of payment of railroad companies for carrying the mails, with certain variations, had been approved by every commission which had studied the matter from the Hubbard Commission in 1878 to the Bourne Commission in 1913. The railroad companies, however, had been able to prevent any change from the weight basis. On August 12, 1911, Postmaster General Hitchcock transmitted to Congress a plan of payment based on space and urged its adoption. No action was taken on his recommendation.

On February 12, 1914, Postmaster General Burleson transmitted a complete scheme of payment based on space and actively championed it before the Congress. He succeeded in having it embraced in the pending Post Office appropriation bill in the spring of 1915. The organized opposition of the railroad companies was able to prevent passage of the bill prior to adjournment of Congress on March 4 of that year, so that for the first time in its history the entire Postal Service was compelled to operate for the ensuing year under the handicap of a joint resolution extending the previous year's appropriations.

The space bill was finally passed on July 28, 1916, and has been in operation since November 1, 1916. It is a scientific and businesslike method of railway mail pay and enables the department to pay for what it receives and the railroads to receive what they earn, which was not possible under the old system of average weights taken once in four years.

The annual saving to the Government under the space system is approximately \$11,470,788. This large saving has resulted mainly from a more intensive loading of the mails on trains, at the same time remitting to the carriers considerable equipment to be employed in other transportation. This saving in car space amounted in the aggregate to the equivalent of 14 trains of 10 cars each daily between New York and Chicago.

The Postal Service during the trying war period was undoubtedly subject to the severest test it has ever undergone. The freight and express services were literally swamped with business, and were obliged to place embargoes on their traffic. The result was that enormous quantities of goods and products of all kinds were thrown into the parcel post, which was not subject to such restrictions. Notwithstanding the immense volume of this new traffic the parcel-post service was conducted without interruption and with dependability and dispatch.

The development of the aeroplane in warfare inspired the belief that it could be made to serve the uses of peaceful transportation, and on May 15, 1918, an aeroplane mail route on a regular schedule was established between New York and Washington. The service operates in about one-half the time required by train between the two cities and is performed with a regularity and a certainty which up to this time has not been equaled anywhere in the world.

An additional aeroplane route has recently been inaugurated between New York and Chicago which by reason of the connections made advances certain eastern mail for the West 24 hours or more. This mail leaves New York at 5 a. m. and arrives in Chicago at 1 p. m. in time for afternoon carrier delivery.

The personnel of the Railway Mail Service has been completely reorganized upon a more efficient basis and at a higher rate of pay. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, 12,653,856.360 pieces of mail matter were distributed, of which 99.98 per cent were distributed correctly. During the year ended June 30, 1918, 14,134,736,744 pieces of mail matter were distributed and the percentage correct was 99.99.

On March 4, 1913, there were 17,095 employees in the Railway Mail Service. On June 15, 1919, there were 20,360 such employees, an increase of 3,265.

On June 30, 1913, the average salary of a railway postal clerk was \$1,239. On May 31, 1919, it was \$1,565—an increase of \$326.

The travel allowance has been increased from \$1 to \$2 per day. Vacation allowances have been increased and working conditions and equipment and construction of cars have steadily improved.

The system of terminal distribution of mail has been developed to take care of the steadily expanding parcel-post traffic and of certain other classes of mail (circulars, etc.), which it is not necessary to distribute on trains. This service is now so efficient that almost daily appeals are made for admission to the mails of certain articles not admissible under the present postal regulations. These appeals are usually explained by the statement that the freight and express services can no longer be depended upon to handle such business.

All of these things have been accomplished during the period of the World War and despite the fact that the Postal Service has lost to the Army and Navy many of its experienced employees and has had to employ many inexperienced ones.

The war, of course, greatly interfered with the foreign mail service. Nevertheless many improvements have been effected. A fuller utilization of contract steamers for the dispatch of mails has effected large economies as well as improvements in the service.

The railroad haul of transit mails across the Isthmus of Panama has been eliminated, reducing costs and also damage from handling.

Mails for China have been routed so as to make more extensive use of the United States postal agency at Shanghai, resulting in better service.

Arrangements have been made with the Shipping Board for the co-operation of its branches at New York, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle in dispatching mails on vessels under control of the board.

The efforts made to extend our foreign trade through the medium of the International Parcel Post have had remarkable results, notwithstanding the disruption of mail routes and the withdrawal of service to many countries occasioned by the war.

On March 4, 1913, when this administration assumed charge of the Post Office Department we had parcel-post conventions with 44 countries. Since then we have extended the service to 18 additional countries, making at present a total of 62 countries. Negotiations with most of these nations and colonies had been in progress for years previous without success.

Provisions of already existing conventions have been enlarged and extended to embrace larger sizes and weights and many articles theretofore barred, and through negotiation many restrictions which had handicapped us have been removed.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, the total weight of parcel post dispatched to all countries was 2,831,512 pounds. During the year ended June 30, 1918, 13,840,266 pounds were dispatched, an increase under the present administration of 389 per cent. The increase for five years preceding June 30, 1913, was only 1,694,822 pounds.

Simplification in methods of accounting and improvement in packing and preparation of parcel-post packages have been brought about. For the first time a provision for the registration of parcels with indemnity in case of loss has been introduced into the International Parcel Post Service.

It was found that under former administrations a one-sided interpretation had been given to the parcel-post convention concluded with Great Britain, which opened up to that country and its possessions the markets of the United States and its possessions, but restricted our manufacturers and exporters to the markets of the British Isles. This matter has been taken up, and the barrier has already been removed between our country and British India, Union of South Africa, Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia, while it is expected that negotiations will open up the markets of the other possessions of Great Britain to our parcel-post exporters in the near future.

Negotiations are being pushed for the extension of Parcel Post Service to additional countries, and it is confidently believed that, for the first time in the history of our Postal Service, we shall soon have such facilities with every important country in the world, as well as nearly all small countries, colonies, and protectorates.

The department has made a new departure in the close cooperation which it has inaugurated with manufacturers, exporters, and representatives of foreign trade bodies. These organizations have established a permanent committee on international parcel post, with offices in New York and Washington, for the purpose of availing themselves of the information and data obtainable from the department.

For the further extension of communication and commerce proposals for a reciprocal domestic letter rate of postage have been made to a number of countries in the Western Hemisphere, and nine such countries and colonies have concluded such conventions with us.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 25, 1919.

I transmit herewith statement of the superintendent of the Division of Stamps, showing the amount of war-savings and thrift stamps sold from the beginning of the sales period to December 31, 1918, to have been \$832,279,373.63.

The statement also shows that \$8,570,663.21 war-revenue stamps were sold by the Post Office Department during the same period.

The statement further discloses the fact that of the \$1,015,067,470.80 war-savings and thrift stamps sold by the Post Office and Treasury Departments, 82 per cent of the total was sold by the Postal Service.

A. M. DOCKERY,
Third Assistant.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 24, 1919.

War-savings and war-revenue stamps sold from the beginning to Dec. 31, 1918.

War-savings	\$826,043,647.63
Thrift	99,830,611.00
Total sales	925,874,258.63
Thrift stamps exchanged	93,594,885.00

Net revenue received from sales of war-savings and thrift stamps	832,279,373.63
War-revenue	8,570,663.21

The total net revenue received from the sales of war-savings and thrift stamps by the Post Office Department from the beginning to December 31, 1918, was 82 per cent of the total net revenue of \$1,015,067,470.80, which includes the net sales reported by the Treasury Department.

FITCH,
Superintendent Division of Stamps.

JUNE 26, 1919.

The progress and development of the Postal Savings System under this administration is worthy of special remark. The following is a summary of the principal facts concerning the operations of the system.

INCREASE IN DEPOSITS.

On June 30, 1913, at the close of the fiscal year 1913 and substantially three months after this administration assumed office, the deposits amounted to \$33,818,870. The following is a statement of the amount on deposit at the close of each succeeding fiscal year and the increase in deposits during each year:

Date.	Amount on deposit.	Increase during year.
June 30, 1914	\$43,444,271	\$9,625,401
June 30, 1915	65,684,708	22,240,437
June 30, 1916	86,019,885	20,335,177
June 30, 1917	131,954,696	45,934,811
June 30, 1918	148,471,499	16,516,803
June 30, 1919	168,500,000	20,000,000

¹ Estimated.

On May 18, 1916, the Congress, on your urgent recommendation, amended the original postal-savings law by removing altogether the monthly limit on deposits of \$100 and increased the amount that a depositor may have to his credit from \$500 to \$1,000. The beneficial effects of this liberalizing legislation are shown in the large increase in deposits in the fiscal year 1917 compared with the increase in the previous fiscal year. The increase in deposits in the fiscal year 1918, while substantial, was considerably less than in other years, but it will be recalled that two great Liberty loan campaigns were conducted during that year, offering investments bearing higher interest rates.

On July 2, 1919, the Congress, also on your urgent recommendation, again amended the postal-savings act by further increasing the amount that a depositor may have to his credit from \$1,000 to \$2,500. Very large gains in deposits followed this legislation, and while the withdrawals recently have been heavy, due to the Government loans and the return of foreign-born depositors to their homes abroad, nevertheless the increase in deposits in the current year is substantial and much greater than in the preceding year.

INCOME FROM DEPOSIT AND INVESTMENT OF FUNDS.

The postal-savings law provides that interest and profit accruing from the deposit and investment of postal savings funds shall be applied to the payment of interest due to postal savings depositors, as provided therein, and the excess covered into the Treasury of the United States as a part of the postal revenue. Pursuant to this direction there has been covered, or there is in process of being covered, into the Treasury the following amounts:

Net interest income accruing in the fiscal year:	
1914	\$431,179.43
1915	584,176.89
1916	712,728.99
1917	1,121,901.30
1918 (estimated)	1,300,000.00
1919 (estimated)	1,600,000.00
Total	5,749,986.61

It will be observed that each year shows a substantial increase in the net interest income.

EXPENSE OF ADMINISTERING THE SYSTEM.

The postal-savings law also requires that the board of trustees of the system shall report annually to Congress "the amount of extra expense of the Post Office Department and the Postal Service incident to the operation of the postal savings depository system." The expense of administration for the fiscal years 1914 to 1919, inclusive (the amount for 1919 being estimated), aggregates \$2,323,856.22. On this basis the profit derived from the administration of the system during the six years named is \$3,426,130.39. It is worthy of note that while the deposits of the system have almost quintupled during this six-year period, the expense of administration for the fiscal year 1919 will amount to only \$425,000, as compared with \$336,000 in the fiscal year 1914. The officers of the system have been untiring in their efforts to work out and install the most improved methods of conducting business and have effected economies wherever it was possible to do so without impairing the service or letting down any safeguard. As a result of their efforts the system has been strengthened; direct and simple methods have been substituted for cumbersome, time-consuming, and vexatious procedure. The business of the system is now efficiently and expeditiously conducted and is giving satisfaction to its patrons. The effect of the improved methods is well exemplified by a statement of the reduction in the staff at the central office of the system in Washington. On May 1, 1913, there were 176 employees in the Division of Postal Savings, and the pay roll for the fiscal year 1914 amounted to \$205,528.32. On June 1, 1919, notwithstanding the fact that the deposits of the system have almost quintupled in the meantime, there were only 79 employees, at annual salaries aggregating \$113,380.

Third Assistant Postmaster General.

JUNE 25, 1919.

You will find below, in tabular form, statistics showing the amount of domestic money orders issued and paid, the fees received for the issue of orders, and the yearly increase of each item for the fiscal years 1913 to 1918, inclusive:

Years.	Domestic money orders issued and paid.	Increase over preceding year.	Receipts from domestic money-order fees.	Increase over preceding year.
1913	\$1,248,613,517.59	\$80,918,480.69	\$5,383,156.76	\$415,463.92
1914	1,332,511,422.31	83,897,904.72	6,051,992.53	668,835.77
1915	1,308,925,604.45	23,585,817.86	6,054,003.32	2,010.79
1916	1,439,949,670.04	131,024,065.59	6,718,550.45	664,547.13
1917	1,628,140,977.31	188,191,307.27	7,427,716.26	709,165.81
1918	1,804,048,147.00	175,907,169.69	7,693,452.75	165,736.49

¹ Decrease.

It will be noted that there was a decrease in the amount of money-order business transacted during the fiscal year 1915, caused by conditions incident to the war, but the transactions for the succeeding years show the usual normal increase.

Among the more important of the improvements in the Postal Money Order System during the past six years is the provision for making postal money orders payable at any money-order post office within 30 days after the date of issue. The necessary congressional authority for this innovation was given in the statute approved February 6, 1914, entitled "An act to regulate the payment of postal money orders," and made effective on July 1, 1914, by your order No. 8014.

The privilege thus granted has added much to the elasticity of the postal money order, and the number of instances in which advantage is taken of it demonstrates clearly that the modification has been of great value to patrons of the service, particularly the traveling public.

A. M. DOCKERY, Third Assistant.

JULY 2, 1919.

During the eight-year period preceding the present administration, covering the administrations of Roosevelt and Taft, the deficiencies in revenues as shown by the audited reports were as follows:

1905, audited deficiency	\$14,594,387.12
1906, audited deficiency	10,542,941.76
1907, audited deficiency	6,692,031.47
1908, audited deficiency	16,910,278.99
Total deficiency	\$48,739,639.34
1909, audited deficiency	17,479,770.47
1910, audited deficiency	5,881,481.95
1911, audited surplus (audited statement for year shows surplus; accounts subsequently settled reduced the surplus to a deficiency of \$732,301.90)	219,118.12
1912, audited deficiency	1,785,523.10

Total deficiency..... 24,927,657.40

Deficiency for eight-year period..... 73,667,296.74

The postal revenues, as audited, show surpluses in each succeeding year, except 1915, in which the receipts of the Postal Service suffered a temporary setback after the outbreak of war in Europe. A statement of surpluses and deficiency follows:

Audited surpluses by years:	
1913	\$4,510,650.91
1914	3,376,463.05
1916	5,829,236.07
1917	9,836,211.90
1918 (excluding \$44,500,000 excess postage as war revenue)	19,626,774.08

Total surpluses..... 44,179,336.01

Audited deficiency, 1915 (declining receipts following outbreak of war in Europe)..... 11,333,308.97

Net surpluses for six-year period..... 32,846,027.04

Respectfully submitted.

A. M. DOCKERY,

Third Assistant Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 28, 1919.

In March, 1913, the Bureau of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General included the Division of Rural Mails, the Division of Supplies, and the Division of Dead Letters.

In cooperation with the Efficiency Commission, a complete survey of the activities of the Division of Dead Letters was inaugurated, which resulted in the immediate improvement of the sanitary conditions incident to the treatment of undelivered mail in the department. Tons of undelivered matter were disposed of forthwith. Thousands of communications received daily, upon which treatment was necessarily delayed, because of the inefficient methods involved in the examination and manipulation thereof, were more promptly acted upon, so that no letter mail remained on hand more than 24 hours. Thousands of pieces of merchandise, mailed as parcel post and lost in transit, were given immediate attention, instead of treatment after days and sometimes weeks of delay. All of this improvement was due to the use of modern mechanical devices, such as lightning letter openers and the introduction of modern office practice.

While under the supervision of the Fourth Assistant, the cost of handling undelivered mail had been reduced approximately \$100,000 per annum, although a vast additional amount of fourth-class or parcel-post mail appeared for treatment.

After the preliminary improved methods had been adopted it was apparent that this function was coincident with the treatment of mailable matter in post offices, and the division, in its improved condition, was transferred to the Bureau of the First Assistant.

At about the same time the Division of Equipment, including the mail-bag repair shops and the mail-lock shops—then under the supervision of the Bureau of the Second Assistant Postmaster General—was transferred to this bureau, because it was recognized that its functions included mechanical operations and the distribution of the product thereof, a character of work similar to the receipt and distribution of supplies, as performed in the Division of Supplies.

Here, again, deplorable sanitary conditions prevailed in the workshops, concerning which health authorities had complained for years. The mail-lock shops were consolidated with the mail-bag repair shops in a building unfitted for mechanical operations, but, nevertheless, the best that could be had under the circumstances, the Government being under contract to continue the rental of the building in which the mail-bag repair shops were located at an exorbitant figure—\$32,000 per annum. In this building the working conditions were such that the employees engaged in the repair of mail bags were compelled to wear dust-protecting devices, and there was continual complaint of the effect of filth and dust upon the health of the working personnel. Forthwith, such improvement as was possible in a poorly designed structure was made. Cleaning devices were installed, so that every mail container sent to the workroom for repairs had as much of the dirt and dust removed therefrom as was possible. Ventilators and fans were provided to remove whatever dust and impure air accumulated.

Nevertheless, the efficiency of operation and the continued care and precaution required to prevent disease were so burdensome that this

department was compelled to call upon the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department for an estimate for the construction of a modern shop building, which when received indicated that the building alone would cost in the neighborhood of \$400,000. Whereupon the Postmaster General sought relief from the Congress, and an appropriation of \$200,000 was provided with which to purchase the land and erect thereon a factory building, and to-day at the corner of Fifth and W Streets NE, there has been erected a steel and concrete manufacturing establishment second to none in the city of Washington—fireproof and sanitary, thoroughly lighted and ventilated, in which, on two shifts of eight hours each, the Post Office Department is manufacturing and repairing almost all of the mail-bag and mail-lock equipment, and also many other items of equipment, used in the Postal Service, and doing so at less cost than it had been possible to produce the same through contract with individuals, firms, or corporations, although the department operates, according to congressional enactment, strictly within an eight-hour day, usual holidays and disability leave, and no child labor, which features are not incident and therefore not expensive to the cost of operation in commercial enterprises.

The improved efficiency of the employees has warranted an increase in salary from 25 to 50 per cent since 1913, and nevertheless the cost of manufacturing and repairing sacks and pouches during the present year is less than it was during 1914.

In that year 88,184 sacks were repaired per month at a unit cost of 7.7 cents, as compared with 232,642 sacks repaired in a single month now at a unit cost of 7.4 cents. While 19,994 pouches were repaired per month in 1914 at an average unit cost of 13.4 cents, there are now approximately 14,184 pouches repaired at a unit cost of 11.2 cents, and this notwithstanding the fact that on July 1, 1919, not a single employee of the equipment section of the Division of Equipment and Supplies will receive less than \$3 per day minimum wage, it being understood that this applies to the employee who has had at least one year's experience on the duties to which such employee may be assigned.

It is worthy of mention that during the year 1918, when the department was unable to secure a reasonable proposal for the manufacture of mail bags on account of conditions incident to the war, that 472,350 No. 1, class A, mail sacks were completed, at a unit cost of 18.9 cents for labor, material, and all overhead expenses, as compared with the lowest proposal tentatively submitted by a manufacturer for making this style of sack at 33.9 cents, or a saving of 15 cents per sack to the Government, an aggregate of \$70,852.50 on this one small lot of mail containers alone.

Naturally, the character of mail matter has been changed, to a larger extent than is apparent to the casual observer, for with the introduction of parcel post two or three pieces of mail will fill an ordinary mail container, whereas formerly thousands of pieces of letter mail could be carried in a single mail sack. It is, therefore, obvious that a vast increase in the number of pieces of mail equipment is necessary. Through the careful selection of lighter canvas it was possible for the department to bring about large savings of money, with no loss to the serviceability of the mail-bag equipment. An instance which is typical or representative of this saving can be given with reference to the 472,350 mail sacks, mention of which is made above. These mail sacks were constructed of light-weight canvas, at a cost of \$712,922.97. For the same number of sacks made out of heavy canvas it would have cost the department an additional sum of \$174,769.50.

Furthermore, it was quite apparent that a vast number of mail containers are used only during the holiday season, a period of about six weeks in the months of November and December each year, and not used during the remaining 104 months of the year. Under such conditions it was evident that a light-weight, medium-priced mail bag would be equally as serviceable as the heavier, more expensive equipment. And upon this assumption thousands and thousands of dollars have been saved to the taxpayer.

While interested in the improvement in production and concerned with the increased necessity for the distribution of larger number of mail containers and the safety devices used thereon, at the same time the Postal Service was using approximately 2,400 canceling machines, which devices were designed to impress a date and cancel the postage stamps attached to mailable matter. Of this number 1,960 were rented from two or three producers who held patents upon various parts of the machines, and the rental amounted to \$300,000 per annum. Proposals were submitted to the owners of these devices to purchase the same, and in accordance therewith prices for the highest grade product, ranging from \$575 to \$1,100, were received. Upon the expiration of the lease or rental agreements of the machines the appropriation provided for such lease or rental was used for the purchase of the machines, and to-day there is not a single canceling machine in the Postal Service leased or rented, and the cost of operation of the same number of units as were formerly in the service, at over \$300,000 per annum, does not exceed \$50,000, a net saving of \$250,000 per year. With this sum the department is now extending the introduction of these devices to hundreds of offices that have heretofore been compelled to use the slow and inefficient hand-canceling method, and it is anticipated that in the near future every postal establishment above the fourth class will be provided with a mechanical canceling device that will improve the efficiency of operation in such offices and will be operated at an expense not to exceed \$100,000 per year.

The cost system introduced since 1913 as a part of the modern shop practice in effect in the equipment branch is as accurate and complete as that in use by any enterprise anywhere, and careful inspection and criticism of the same is invited by anyone at any time.

In this division many new mechanical and labor-saving devices have been approved and perfected. A uniform rural letter box was designed. It is interesting to note that patrons of the Rural Delivery Service have expended in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000 for letter boxes, and realizing that many of these devices were sold and distributed at exorbitant prices, the department designed a uniform type, and those that are now distributed to the rural patrons are all subject to the approval of the department, such approval including in addition to the material used in the same the cost or the price at which it is sold to the public. Thus, in a small way, the department endeavors to protect the patron in the quality of instrument purchased and in the reasonable cost to him of the same. Nearly 1,000,000 mail locks, lighter in weight, smaller in size, and far more efficient in service, have been designed and placed in use. Where formerly possibly more than 40,000 locks were returned annually, less than 2,000 now appear. The cost of repairs has been reduced to a nominal figure, while the cost of manufacture of each lock has been reduced from 18 cents to less than 8 cents. At the same time, to provide greater security in the transportation of mail matter, a lock cord fastener is now being experimented with which will still further reduce the cost of the construction of cord fasteners, and provide greater safety to the mailable matter within the container to which they are attached.

In 1910 the Postal Service used 84 carloads, or 2,520,000 pounds, of twine. To-day, with more than double the amount of mailable matter, including the vast increase due to the parcel post, the Postal Service consumed but 70 carloads of twine, or about 2,100,000 pounds, a net reduction in the quantity of twine consumed of nearly one-half million pounds per annum. This conservation in the use of twine followed an intensive campaign to impress upon postal employees the necessity for careful saving and reuse of every possible pound thereof.

Notwithstanding the distribution of 2,000,000 pounds of twine, as well as vastly increased quantities of necessary supplies and equipment essential to the successful operation of the Postal Service, there has been no substantial increase in the cost of such distribution, owing to the establishment of specified distributing offices where supplies and equipment are shipped in large case and freight lots, and thence distributed on short hauls to postal establishments dependent upon the central supply offices for their requirements. The economy in such a system must be apparent to everybody. The system is now in effect in 37 States and Territories and is rapidly being extended to the remaining States.

These improvements in method and increased efficiency in the detail of operation are only minor when compared with the larger field of activity in which this bureau has endeavored to serve the public on the principle that the postal administration should provide the maximum of service to the people at the minimum of expense to the taxpayer.

Since the year 1914, 4,986,079 additional patrons in rural territory who had never had adequate mail facilities are now supplied therewith, at an additional expense of but \$500,000 appropriated in the year 1914, and not one single dollar since. At the same time the appropriation for increased compensation of the employees engaged in the collection and delivery of mail on rural routes has increased from \$47,000,000 to \$68,800,000. The number of pieces of mail handled annually has increased from 3,093,350,334 in 1913 to 3,870,068,064 in 1919, or an increase of 776,717,730 pieces. The average length of the rural routes on March 4, 1913, was 24.22 miles, while to-day they are but 25.82, or 1.6 miles longer. This is true, notwithstanding the fact that 833 routes, known as motor rural routes of 50 miles or greater in length, have been established where the use of a motor vehicle, with reasonable regularity throughout the year, is assured.

On March 4, 1913, over 2,600 petitions for the establishment and extension of rural routes had been pending for several years in the department. Nevertheless, before July 1, 1913, this number had been reduced to 834 and to-day the total number of petitions for establishment or extension of service pending in this department does not exceed 368, and not one of them has been here a period of one year.

A careful survey, based upon a report of the Bureau of the Census for 1910, disclosed that the rural population of the United States was about 52,000,000, and that, of this number, approximately 28,200,000 are domiciled on or adjacent to rural routes, 2,000,000 reside in the vicinity of star contract mail routes, and that about 13,000,000 are provided with mail facilities at third and fourth class post offices. Consequently, there are approximately 1,000,000 families in rural territory who are not provided with adequate mail service.

It has been and will continue to be the desire of this department to extend mail facilities to these pioneers of national development at reasonable cost. It is but natural that such extension would be far more expensive than the average cost of prevailing service, for in 1913 the cost of Rural Delivery Service per person was \$1.97, and, notwithstanding the increase of \$20,000,000 in compensation to carriers employed in this service, or approximately 50 per cent, the cost per patron had been reduced to \$1.913 in 1918. However, it is certain that a vast improvement in the extension of mail facilities to a large proportion of the rural population not now provided with the same could be accomplished through the improvement of the highways and the efficient use of the same in the transportation of largely increased quantities of mailable matter.

It is evident that the successful, profitable operation of rural delivery is dependent upon the character of the highway over which the operation is performed, and this department is deeply concerned in the construction and improvement of the highways, not only because of the possible financial return and economy of operation that would be apparent, but also because it would permit the extension of mail service to all possible postal patrons. This will explain the activity and interest of the department in the improvement of the highways, for in 1913 there was available in the postal appropriation \$500,000 to be expended in cooperation with the several States for experiments in the construction and improvement of highways, and through the application of this small appropriation and the further activity and interest of this department there is to-day available for the next three years the sum of \$200,000,000, which will aid very materially, when a similar sum has been provided by the States for this purpose, in the extension and improvement of new and additional mail facilities to the farmer producer, who may then overcome the difference in the amount of parcel post mail matter which averages six pieces per route per day delivered into rural territory, as over against one piece per route per day transported from country to city patrons. Furthermore, through such improvement of the highways and the use thereof in the transportation of foodstuffs it would be possible to convey over good roads an average of not less than 1,800 pounds per day, as compared with the present 24 pounds conveyed per route per day, and thus the highways, the efficient use thereof, and the Postal Service may become a tremendous factor in the substantial reduction of the cost of living.

The transportation of mail in bulk from supply offices located on rail or water transportation to offices in the interior has vastly increased in the last six years, and new methods of operation were necessary to accommodate the great quantity of parcel post that appeared for conveyance. At Vernal, Utah, a bank building was wholly constructed from materials transported by parcel post. Everywhere in the West great quantities of material appeared for mailing because the postal means of communication were all that were available in the development of tremendous areas. Consequently the department organized the plan to advertise for the carriage of first and second class mail and perishable parcel post at a flat rate per annum on a fast schedule and the conveyance of third-class and ordinary parcel-post mail on a slower schedule at pound rates. This plan enabled the department to secure reasonable proposals for the service required, and effected the saving of \$500,000 during the fiscal year 1915 for the Government.

During the year 1917 the department was authorized to advertise for contracts that would require the exclusive use of motor vehicles in the transportation of mail on star routes. This marked one of the most progressive advances in postal activity, for mail is not only delivered earlier than would otherwise be possible to a large number of post offices located on branch railroad lines but to offices from

which rural routes emanated, and thus the mail from cities is delivered 24 to 48 hours earlier than formerly, with corresponding advantages in the dispatch of outgoing mail.

Within the last few years many advertisements for service on star routes required the contractor to make box delivery and collection service, sell stamps, and provide money-order and registry facilities to patrons domiciled on the roads covered by the routes. These additional facilities have been provided at no substantial increased expense, and have resulted in convenience to thousands of patrons, almost all of whom are remote from other postal conveniences.

A new function known as village delivery has been authorized since 1913, and at the close of that year 101 post offices had been supplied with this apparently desirable service. A total of 126 carriers were employed at an average annual compensation of \$625 each. On July 1, 1919, the service will be in operation at 570 offices, with 832 carriers employed at an average annual compensation of \$783 each. The entire departmental office force used to establish and conduct this service consists of one clerk and a stenographer.

This bureau believes that its record for accomplishment warrants the privilege of administrative discretion in the establishment of rural routes from 36 miles in length to 50 miles in length where at present it is impossible, on account of legislative restrictions, to provide routes of that length. The motor vehicle has revolutionized the means of conveyance everywhere, and its value should not be curtailed in its application to problems of transportation in the Postal Service any more than it is in its usefulness in the commercial world.

JAS. I. BLAKSLEE, Fourth Assistant.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] for 20 minutes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the adjournment of Congress I spent several weeks in France, Belgium, and Germany going over the war-swept areas of France and Belgium. It was my privilege to visit the battle fields, including the area around Chateau-Thierry, including a little wood near there known as Belleau Wood, made forever famous by the valiant fighting of the Fifth and Sixth Marine Regiments. I followed the pathway of the glorious Rainbow Division, representing, as it did, 26 of the States of our Union, including a Minnesota regiment—the One hundred and fifty-first Field Artillery. I saw where it pounded its way through the German lines into the St. Mihiel salient. Then I traveled through the scene of the great Meuse-Argonne conflict, the greatest of American battles, where over 26,000 American soldiers paid the last supreme measure of devotion and countless other thousands added new luster to American arms.

Among these valiant men in these various conflicts were many young men from my own city—the city of Minneapolis. Early in the spring of 1917 the high schools and the State University in my city furnished 600 of their young men, eager to be the "first to fight." They joined the Marine Corps. Others joined our efficient National Guard regiments or went into the Regular Army, while still more, accepting their country's call, went in to swell the ranks of the great National Army. Here and there I visited the battle-field cemeteries where rested the fallen.

On my return, in speaking before the Marine Fathers' Association of Minneapolis, telling them somewhat of my experiences, at the close of my talk I was asked, as a Member of Congress, to use my best efforts to find out who was responsible for the consideration, sympathy, and undue favor shown to so-called conscientious objectors. The one making the request had a son in the service. He voiced the sentiments of not only every father and mother there present but of every parent whose son had willingly responded to the call of country. He also voiced the sentiments of numerous men in the service who could not understand the policy of the Government toward the man who would not fight.

From the fall of 1917 until the present time everyone has known that numerous conscienceless objectors, consisting of pro-Germans, I. W. W., political Socialists, and cowardly slackers, were being exempted from all military service; that they were being shown special consideration in the camps, and were not being held to obey military law or to submit to military discipline. These were not mere idle rumors, for practically everyone with friends in the various camps knew these conditions to be true. There was in the minds of many a pressing inquiry as to who was responsible. Was it Congress? No; it was not Congress. The selective-service law, passed on May 18, 1917, contained this provision:

(i) Any person who is found by such local board to be a member of any well-recognized religious sect or organization organized and existing May 18, 1917, and whose then existing creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form, and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein in accordance with the creed or principles of said religious organization.—Any such person upon presentation to such local board at any time within 10 days after the filing of a claim for discharge by or in respect of such person, of an affidavit made by such person stating that he is a member in good faith and in good standing of a well-recognized religious sect or organization (giving the name thereof) organized and existing May 18, 1917, and whose then existing creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form, and that his religious convictions are against war or participation therein in accordance with the creed or principles of said religious organization. And upon the presentation to such local board of an affidavit made by the clerk or minister of the well-recognized religious sect or organiza-

tion to which such person claiming exemption is a member, stating that said person is a member of said religious sect or organization, which was well recognized and was organized and existing May 18, 1917, and that the then existing creed or principles of said religious sect or organization forbid its members to participate in war in any form; and upon presentation by affidavits of such other evidence as may be required in the opinion of the local board to substantiate the claim of any such person.

Said act of Congress provides, section 3:

But no person so exempted shall be exempted from service in any capacity that the President shall declare to be noncombatant.

In case any such person substantiates, in the opinion of the local board, his claim, such local board shall issue a certificate stating that such person shall not be required or compelled to serve in any capacity except in some capacity declared by the President to be noncombatant.

Note, to be exempt from combatant service he must personally have religious convictions against war. Those convictions must be in accordance with the then existing creed of a religious organization and of which he must have been a member. Failing in any one of these particulars, exemption could not be given. The individual with mere conscientious scruples against war was not exempt. The individual with conscientious religious scruples against war must serve. The only exemption was to a member of a religious organization with an existing creed against war which he believed in and subscribed to, and even in that event persons were exempt from combatant service only. Congress in that way tried to prevent the law from exempting only those who by long religious training and association had conscientious convictions against war.

This remained the law throughout the war. The exemption proviso framed by Congress did not include the pro-German, the I. W. W., the political Socialist, or cowardly slacker. This was the expression of Congress upon the subject.

Congress, then, was not responsible. Was it the draft boards? No.

The selective-service regulations further safeguarded the law by providing for the filing of affidavits with the draft board and the issuance by the board of a certificate exempting the person certified thereon from combatant service only. The draftee had to report at the camp and await his assignment by military authorities to noncombatant service. On the whole, the draft boards conscientiously carried out the law and the regulations to the very letter. In my district and, as I am advised, throughout the country they were made up of patriotic, high-grade men, who performed their duties well.

My investigation disclosed that the responsibility was not with Congress nor with the draft boards, but rested entirely upon the War Department. I propose now to demonstrate this by documentary evidence of the department itself.

First. The Secretary of War issued his order setting aside the selective-draft act relating to conscientious objectors and enlarging the exemption clause, thereby permitting the I. W. W., the pro-German, the political Socialist, and cowardly slacker to evade military service, both combatant and noncombatant.

Second. The War Department, through the Secretary, supplied information to and cooperated with an organization formed to enable men to evade the draft.

Third. It issued orders to the various cantonment commanders kindly, considerably, and specially to treat and deal with the so-called conscientious objectors, going so far as to engage sympathetic men to travel about the country at the expense of the Government to see to it that such treatment was in fact accorded.

Fourth. These orders were issued covertly, accompanied by instructions enjoining secrecy.

As to the first proposition: On December 10, 1917, the Secretary issued his order directing "that personal scruples against war" should be considered as constituting "conscientious objections."

Note carefully the language of the order given:

[Confidential.]

DECEMBER 10, 1917.

From: The Adjutant General of the Army.

To: The commanding generals of all National Army and National Guard camps except Camp Grant.

Subject: Conscientious objectors.

1. The Secretary of War directs that until further instructions on the subject are issued "personal scruples against war" should be considered as constituting "conscientious objections" and such persons should be treated in the same manner as other "conscientious objectors" under the instructions contained in confidential letter from this office dated October 10, 1917.

2. Under no circumstances should these instructions be communicated to the newspapers.

H. G. LEARNARD,
Adjutant General.

Here was a deliberate change and enlargement of the exemption proviso in palpable violation of law and by the exercise of authority which the Secretary did not possess. What right had the Secretary of War to legislate? What power did he possess to amend an act of Congress? Under the term "personal scr-

uples" the I. W. W., pro-German, political Socialist, and cowardly slacker sought and obtained exemption. The I. W. W. could qualify thereunder, for he had scruples against war and certainly they were personal. The pro-German could qualify, for personally he loved Germany better than America, and he had scruples against waging war against Germany. His reasons were personal. The same would apply to certain political Socialists and slackers seeking exemption. Their reasons also were "personal" and they "scrupled" against making war on behalf of any country, many of them despising the institutions of their own country. This change was made advisedly. I call attention to the memorandum of the Secretary of War to the General Staff bearing date December 8, 1918:

The so-called conscientious objectors present a novel problem in military administration. To some extent the novelty and difficulty of this problem was recognized by the Congress, which made express provision for a part of the general class. However, when the law came to be administered it was found that only certain varieties of religious experience had been adequately provided for, and that other varieties of religious obligation and the whole class of conscientious objection based upon ethical considerations and not directly associated with formal religious beliefs was unprovided for. The President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, thereupon laid down a definite policy for the administration of the law, and the discipline of those called to the service who were affected by any of these forms of conscientious objection not specifically included within the limits of the statute.

This order constitutes a perversion of the Federal statute. Congress did not make provision for a part only of a general class, but in accurate and certain terms defined the class of persons to be considered conscientious objectors. And by careful reservations and restrictions eliminated the very persons included in the Secretary's order. In other words, the Secretary of War, as the administrative officer, did not confine himself to an application of the act of Congress, but treated the act as an elastic thing to be stretched by him to cover such persons as in his judgment should have been included by the Congress.

One variety of conscientious objector was not enough for the Secretary of War. He would add thereto; he would change and amend the act of Congress so as to include Heinz's 57 varieties of conscientious objectors. Thus what was made certain by law was made uncertain by executive mandate. The observation of the Secretary that Congress did not make "provision for" is literally accurate, but it did make provision against the hypocritical slacker who sought to evade military service.

As to the substantiation of the charge that the War Department supplied information to and cooperated with the enemies of the selective-service law, I quote from the letter of May 19, 1918, of the Third Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Keppel, to the director of the Civil Liberties Bureau, the material portion of which is as follows:

I have had a talk with the Secretary of War with reference to the question which you raised, and I have also consulted some of his military associates, and we have all come to the conclusion that under the circumstances it would not be in the public interest for us to continue to supply information pursuant to your request or otherwise to cooperate in any way with the Civil Liberties Bureau.

In other words, the War Department admits "cooperating with" and having supplied "information to" a bureau whose leader was later convicted of attempting to get others to evade the draft. They admit supplying this information. [Applause.] They admit cooperating with this bureau. The Military Intelligence Division of their own department had knowledge of this information, with which knowledge the entire department must be charged.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I do.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman has just read a quotation from Assistant Secretary Keppel. I wish he would read the rest of the statement, which I have before me.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I have only a part of the letter. I have no objection to adding the other part. I was going to cover it in another portion of my address.

Mr. HAYDEN. He says:

At the present time the activities of this bureau—

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I prefer not to yield for more than a question. I will read the balance of the statement, as follows:

I have before me a memorandum from the Military Intelligence Bureau which gives in detail evidence of the activities of the bureau which seem to justify this decision and of which I had not previously known.

A Roger Baldwin was one of the leading spirits in this so-called liberty bureau. Mr. Baldwin is now serving time for obstructing the draft. He was a so-called conscientious objector and espoused the cause of all so-called conscientious objectors, and for his conduct in so doing he was tried, convicted, and sentenced to a year in prison, and while in

prison he so badly conducted himself that he had to be transferred to another place and must serve the full length of his sentence without any deduction for good behavior. And yet our Secretary of War "cooperated" with this man and the bureau with which he was identified and supplied Baldwin and the bureau with information, and that information was such that finally out of deference to public sentiment they were compelled to discontinue it.

It will not do to offer as an excuse that the department withdrew its cooperation when it ascertained the character of the organization. It was its imperative duty not to disclose valuable military information or to give assistance to any organization until it did know and know definitely that it was worthy of such aid and assistance.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Five minutes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I am afraid I can not yield.

Mr. BEE. I want to ask the gentleman one question in that connection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I may have time at the close of my remarks, and if so I will be very glad to yield.

As to the third proposition, I quote from the following order of the Secretary of War commanding that kindly and special consideration be given these men:

[Confidential.]
EXHIBIT 6.

OCTOBER 10, 1917.

From: The Adjutant General of the Army.

To: The commanding generals of all National Army and National Guard division camps.

Subject: Conscientious objectors.

1. The Secretary of War directs that you be instructed to segregate the conscientious objectors in their divisions and to place them under supervision of instructors who shall be specially selected with a view of insuring that these men will be handled with tact and consideration and that their questions will be answered fully and frankly.

2. With reference to their attitude of objecting to military service these men are not to be treated as violating military laws, thereby subjecting themselves to the penalties of the Articles of War, but their attitude in this respect will be quietly ignored and they will be treated with kindly consideration. Attention in this connection is invited to a case where a number of conscientious objectors in one of our divisions, when treated in this manner, renounced their original objections to military service and voluntarily offered to give their best efforts to the service of the United States as soldiers.

3. It is desired that after the procedure above indicated shall have been followed for a sufficient length of time to afford opportunity to judge of the results derived from it, a report of the action taken and the results obtained under these instructions be submitted to the War Department by each division commander. As a result of the consideration of all these reports further instructions will be issued by the Secretary of War as to the policy to be observed in future in the case of conscientious objectors.

4. Under no circumstances are the instructions contained in the foregoing to be given to the newspapers.

H. G. LEARNARD,
Adjutant General.

This order needs no comment.

I quote further from the letter of the Secretary of War bearing date of June 1, 1918:

If, however, any drafted man, upon his arrival at camp, either through the presentation of a certificate from his local board or by written statement addressed by himself to the commanding officer, shall record himself as a conscientious objector, he shall not, against his will, be required to wear a uniform or to bear arms; nor if, pending the final decision as to his status, he shall decline to perform, under military direction, duties which he states to be contrary to the dictates of his conscience, shall he receive punitive treatment for such conduct.

Is it not extending undue consideration, is it not disgusting coddling, to permit a soldier to fix his status in the Army by an unsworn statement that "I object"?

Even this was insufficient for this zealous and sympathetic friend of the so-called conscientious objector. Following the issuance of these orders a special board, consisting of a military officer and two civilians, was appointed to visit the camps and to see that this special consideration was being uniformly given these men. Moreover, in violation of the letter and spirit of the law, men who refused noncombatant service were furloughed to work on the farm; and for fear that the farmer would mistreat this citizen, additional help was employed for the purpose of protecting this governmental favorite against the farmer's exploitation. I quote from a letter of the Third Assistant Secretary of War to the Secretary of War, bearing date June 13, 1919:

In placing men that enjoy the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture we engage a special commissioner to look after the details of their assignment and to see, on the one hand, that they perform their duty efficiently, and, on the other hand, that they are not exploited.

Would that the department had shown one part of the consideration for the fighting men who unwittingly transgressed military laws and regulations that they did for the so-called conscientious objector! [Applause.]

Would an unsworn statement bearing upon punishment proposed to be inflicted upon a real soldier—a fighting man—have established a controlling fact to his advantage? If recent disclosures as to the administration of military justice are to be believed, his sworn statement received only too scant and too meager consideration.

As to the fourth proposition, that of secrecy, you will note that the letters concluded with this significant language:

Under no circumstances should these instructions be given to the newspapers.

I wonder if this injunction against letting the people know what was transpiring was prompted by fear of public condemnation and disapproval.

What was the result of this course of catering and coddling? Maj. Frank S. White, jr., camp judge advocate at Camp Funston, a resident of Birmingham, Ala., in a public interview, said:

Camp Funston was selected as a dumping ground for the segregation of a large number of these so-called conscientious objectors. The military authorities had no trouble whatever in dealing with those having religious scruples against engaging in combatant service. They all readily accepted such noncombatant service as was assigned to them.

There was, however, a large number of alleged conscientious objectors, who, when selected under the draft act, made no claim that they had religious scruples against fighting, but pretended to have conscientious objections based upon the view of the obligations which they owed to the country.

MOSTLY FOREIGN RADICALS.

They were composed in the main of German, Austrian, Russian Socialists, and I. W. W., who openly denied the right of the United States to induct them into the military service, some of whom had endeavored to get commissions in the Army and after having failed to do so, when drafted, conveniently found themselves opposed to engaging in military service, and then, when ordered to perform noncombatant duty, openly declared that they owed this country no duty, refused to obey any order from a military source, thereby defying the military arm of the Government.

These men had conspired together and refused to obey the lawful commands of a superior officer to wear the uniform of the United States Army or to take a rake and rake up hay and load it on a wagon; or to police up around their own quarters. Charges had been preferred against them for violation of the sixty-fourth article of war, and they were in confinement in the provost guardhouse awaiting trial or result of trial by general court-martial.

DID NOT BELIEVE IN DEITY.

The selective-service law exempted from combatant service all persons who because of religious belief claimed exemption from military service, but no person so exempted from combatant service was exempted from noncombatant service. These men did not come within the purview of the act affording exemption from military service to sincere, religious objectors. They were admittedly Socialists and proven to be pro-Germans, who did not believe in Deity, and whose aim was to spread insidious and treasonable propaganda throughout this country, and were actually caught in disseminating it in this military camp, which was subversive of all discipline and destructive of the morale of our Army.

The act referred to was never intended, as the War Department interpreted it, to extend exemption to men such as those, who were nothing less than slackers and cowards or pro-Germans. If men of this character were not dealt with promptly and vigorously the whole principle of universal service would fall to the ground. These simulated objectors were confined with a large number of general prisoners and with these other prisoners, under military custom, were required to police their quarters and around their premises. This they openly and defiantly refused to do, throwing their share of the work upon the other prisoners, dissatisfying them, and setting before these other prisoners this example of disobedience and defiance of authority.

ENCOURAGED FROM OUTSIDE.

They would even refuse to march in orderly formation to and from their mess, but would straggle along as they saw fit, and when being ordered out to mess or exercise they would stand in the doorway and block it so that the guards or other persons could not pass, defying the guards and officers to move them; they refused to take exercise, baths, and keep their bodies and belongings clean and in a sanitary condition; they refused to be vaccinated or inoculated in order to safeguard themselves as well as their fellow soldiers from sickness and disease. In fact, they refused to obey and apparently took pleasure in letting it be known that they would take no part under the Military Establishment nor obey any military command whatever. In their attitude they repeatedly let it be known that they were receiving encouragement from outside sources and claiming they would be protected in their attitude by the War Department.

To illustrate their recalcitrant attitude, if the meals which were provided for them and other prisoners did not suit them they would engage in throwing the dishes, camp stools, and their mess kits around the mess hall, acting in the most mutinous and disorderly manner. When ordered to stand at attention by officers engaged in inspection duty, they would refuse to assume a proper position; in order to provoke these officers they would defiantly put their feet as far apart as possible and make grimaces at them, asking them what they were going to do about it.

In brief, Maj. White claims that as a result of the law as amended by the Secretary of War the camps were infested with I. W. W., German sympathizers, and craven cowards—men who would not fight nor even obey mere police and health regulations of the camp.

The above attitude and the acts connected therewith were the acts of the Secretary of War; but, in addition to that, by reason of the position he occupied and the fact that his attitude in this matter was known to the President, they were also the acts of the President of the United States. For in a

letter to the President bearing date July 2, 1918, the Secretary of War informed the Commander in Chief that—

We are now doing all that public opinion will stand in the interest of conscientious objectors and others whose views do not happen to coincide with those of the vast majority of their fellow countrymen.

Yes, indeed; they were doing far more than public opinion would have stood for.

Is it any wonder that the camp officers were warned not to disclose the situation to the newspapers?

Further in a letter of March 23, 1918, the President—

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield? What letter of the President does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I refer to an Executive order.

Mr. AYRES. Has the gentleman that order?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I have. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Very well. Let us hear it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I now quote from an Executive order of the President issued on March 23, 1918:

2. Persons ordered to report for military service under the above act who have (a) been certified by their local boards to be members of a religious sect or organization as defined in section 4 of said act; or (b) who object to participating in war because of conscientious scruples but have failed to receive certificates as members of a religious sect or organization from their local board, will be assigned to non-combatant military service as defined in paragraph 1 to the extent that such persons are able to accept service as aforesaid without violation of the religious or other conscientious scruples by them in good faith entertained. Upon the promulgation of this order it shall be the duty of each division, camp, or post commander, through a tactful and considerate officer, to present to all such persons the provisions hereof with adequate explanation of the character of noncombatant service herein defined, and upon such explanations to secure acceptances of assignment to the several kinds of noncombatant service above enumerated; and whenever any person is assigned to noncombatant service by reason of his religious or other conscientious scruples, he shall be given a certificate stating the assignment and reason therefor, and such certificate shall thereafter be respected as preventing the transfer of such persons from such noncombatant to combatant service by any division, camp, post, or other commander under whom said person may thereafter be called to serve, but such certificate shall not prevent the assignment of such person to some other form of noncombatant service with his own consent. So far as may be found feasible by each division, camp, or post commander, future assignments of such persons to noncombatant military service will be restricted to the several detachments and units of the medical department in the absence of a request for assignment to some other branch of noncombatant service as defined in paragraph 1 hereof.

[Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Is not that the law that Congress passed?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It is not. May I have five minutes more, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The time is in the control of the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. NOLAN. My time has been parceled out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. UPSHAW. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I have no time left, unless I am granted more time.

Mr. NOLAN. I have 35 minutes, Mr. Speaker, and I have no time to grant.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield the 10 minutes on this side to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall yield three minutes to the gentleman if he will answer my questions.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. That will depend on the questions.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall yield to the gentleman three minutes of my time or I will take the floor in my own time and ask the gentleman a few questions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assumes that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed, not upon the bill before the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that the President after the congressional definition of conscientious objector inserts the following:

Or who objects to participating in war because of conscientious scruples.

And later on uses the expression "religious or other conscientious scruples."

The only change from the words of his Secretary is that the President uses the term "conscientious scruples" whereas the Secretary uses the term "personal scruples." Both refer to other than religious conscientious objectors. By this Executive order an act of Congress was deliberately amended and enlarged, not in furtherance of the legislative will but in direct conflict therewith. Under the proviso as changed by the Secretary of War and by the President anyone religious or atheistic, believer in a creed or disbeliever, organizationist or individual, a person with convictions against war in existence when war broke out or a person who had conceived these convictions while on his way to the draft board, were brought within this peculiar exemption.

Under the Constitution it is the duty of Congress to raise armies. In raising the Army to wage war against Germany they laid down the principle that in a country where there was equality of opportunity there was a corresponding duty upon our citizens to serve that country and to defend it against enemies, both foreign and domestic, but recognizing that there were a few individuals belonging to certain religious organizations who had subscribed to certain creeds in good faith and had conscientious convictions against shooting their fellow men even in time of war. In deference to such individuals they were exempted from service as combatants, but were expressly directed that notwithstanding these convictions they must serve in a noncombatant capacity.

Congress had determined what constituted a conscientious objector and by implication what did not. Yet the Secretary of War and the President assumed the authority to make addition to the terms "personal scruples" and "conscientious scruples" and to apply perhaps the rule of self-determination and to permit the individual to decide for himself whether or not he would serve his country. In that connection I quote from the letter of the Third Assistant Secretary of War, bearing date September 28, 1918:

To the COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION:

It has been the liberal American policy of according a measure of self-determination to the few who in all sincerity have not been able to adjust their minds to the needs of this sudden and desperate emergency.

There can be but one answer to the oft-repeated question as to responsibility for the policy pursued in reference to the conscientious objector. That responsibility rests upon the Secretary of War and the President of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. HAYDEN. I desire to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he has carefully read the statement concerning the treatment of conscientious objectors in the Army, issued by the War Department on June 18, 1919?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I have.

Mr. HAYDEN. In that statement, from which the gentleman quoted a part relative to the relations between the Third Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Keppel, and the so-called Civil Liberties Bureau, is a letter in which the statement is made that the War Department would have nothing further to do with that bureau.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The reason for that statement was, as I am reliably informed, that at the beginning of the activities of this self-constituted Civil Liberties Bureau the War Department was not aware of the character of the work that the men who controlled it were carrying on. After having discovered the pernicious nature of their activities, as exposed by the Military Intelligence Service, under date of September 11, 1918, this letter was written by the Third Assistant Secretary of War to the chairman and directors of the Civil Liberties Bureau:

You and Baldwin—

That is the same Baldwin to whom the gentleman from Minnesota referred—

are aware of the position of the department with reference to dealing with the National Civil Liberties Bureau. When you two and Mr. Codman called upon the Secretary and were referred to me you called as individuals and were assured that the matters to which you referred would have careful attention. They have had, and are having such attention. I can only repeat to you personally what I told you then, that in my judgment the activities of the Civil Liberties Bureau as such at the present time are a distinct hindrance and in no way a help in carrying these matters to a satisfactory conclusion.

This is the letter, printed on the same page of the statement of the War Department from which the gentleman from Minnesota obtained the first reference to the Civil Liberties Bureau which he read, but which he did not see fit to also read to the House.

And it was for the reasons given in Mr. Keppel's letter that the War Department refused to have anything further to do with the Civil Liberties Bureau. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman deny, then, that they did furnish information to this bureau and that they did cooperate with this bureau?

Mr. HAYDEN. Just as the War Department would deal with any other individual in the United States who asked for information, and the department did so until the Secretary of War ascertained the harmful character of their work. Then he promptly and properly declined to furnish them any further information.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman affirm that it was not the business of the War Department first to find out what this bureau was about before they furnished them information and cooperated with them? [Applause.]

Mr. HAYDEN. It was not the province of the War Department to presume that any group of American citizens were disloyal until some proof was presented to that effect. When the Military Intelligence Service submitted evidence that the Civil Liberties Bureau was obstructing the operations of the draft law the Secretary of War at once acted to prevent the officers of that bureau from obtaining any further information from his department. The letter that the gentleman has read and the letter that I have read both demonstrate the truth of what I have said.

When complaint was made to the War Department that conscientious objectors were not receiving proper consideration in the camps, when the charge was made that they were receiving brutal treatment, when such complaints and charges, whether true or not, were brought to the attention of the War Department, it was the duty of the Secretary, of course, to find out the facts and advise the party complaining of the result of the investigations. This so-called Civil Liberties Bureau organized itself for that purpose; its ostensible object was to see that no citizen was unlawfully deprived of his civil rights. At the beginning those who formed this organization seemed to be acting on the square and not attempting to interfere with the draft law. The department at first cooperated with them; but as soon as the Secretary discovered the real nature of their efforts this relation at once ceased.

The gentleman from Minnesota also pointed out the fact that a certain order of the War Department directed the various camp commanders not to give newspaper publicity to the instructions contained therein that conscientious objectors should be segregated and treated with tact and consideration. The Secretary of War then had in mind the appointment of a commission whose duty it would be to visit all of the Army camps in the United States and to investigate the sincerity of the claims of all conscientious objectors. The reason for that injunction against publicity was not to protect the objectors but to protect the Army.

If the War Department had widely advertised the order directing the segregation of conscientious objectors and their humane treatment and had publicly announced that a commission was to be appointed to visit the various camps and ascertain whether such objectors were sincere, the result would have been that many drafted men who were seeking an excuse to evade military service would have claimed exemption on the ground of conscientious objection to war. It would have been nothing more than an invitation to slackers and cowards to declare themselves. In order to avoid that very thing, to keep that information from those who had no stomach for the war, the Secretary directed that no newspaper publicity be given. [Applause.] That was but common sense. Such secrecy could be of no possible advantage to the conscientious objectors. Why the War Department should be criticized for so wise a policy is beyond my understanding.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman contend that the Secretary of War did not go beyond the act of Congress in extending the meaning of the words "conscientious objector"?

Mr. HAYDEN. The President of the United States as the Commander in Chief had an undoubted right to say what should be done with any soldier in the Army. If any drafted individual claimed exemption on the ground that he did not believe in war, that it was against his concept of religion, the President, acting through the Secretary of War, had the right to deal with him in a just and humane manner. In carrying out the policy of testing the sincerity of individual conscientious objectors who were not members of any well-recognized religious sect the Secretary of War acted clearly within the authority granted him by law.

Mr. TINCHER. Then what was the use of defining a conscientious objector in the law?

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not a fact that the question was whether a conscientious objector was absolutely exempt from the draft, whereas the regulation made by the Secretary of War was not an exemption from the draft but to determine the character of the service?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; under the selective-draft law it was a question whether he was a member of a well-recognized religious sect whose creed forbid its members to participate in war; and if so, he could not be compelled to do combatant service. Actual experience demonstrated that there were a number of sincerely religious men who were not members of a recognized church and yet were undoubtedly conscientious in their opposition to war. If the religious convictions of such a man who claimed his spiritual authority from the divine command "Thou shalt not kill" were found to be honest and sincere, why should he not receive the same treatment as the member of a recognized sect? In my opinion the Secretary of War did right by giving such religious fanatics the same treatment as was granted to other conscientious objectors.

In this report which I hold in my hand, submitted by the Secretary of War on June 18, 1919, the whole question of the treatment of conscientious objectors is discussed in great detail. Every law, every order, every regulation, everything that was done, all the statistics relating to conscientious objectors are to be found in this report. The report shows that there were 64,693 claims for noncombatant classification, of which 56,830 were recognized as valid by the local boards. Of the last number, 20,873 were actually inducted into service, every one of whom went to the cantonments with a certificate in his pocket that he should be recognized as a sincere conscientious objector and not compelled to do any actual fighting. But when these men arrived in camp and learned what the war was about, learned what patriotism really meant, when they saw thousands of others cheerfully preparing themselves to perform their highest duty, four-fifths of them forgot their religious or other fanatical notions and became willing soldiers ready for any service. The actual figures are that but 3,989, or less than one out of every five, made any claim in camp for exemption from any form of military service.

The board of inquiry appointed by the Secretary of War to investigate the sincerity of conscientious objectors, therefore, had a little less than 4,000 cases to consider. That board consisted of Maj. Richard C. Stoddard, of the Judge Advocate General's office, Julian W. Mack, a Federal judge, and H. F. Stone, dean of the Columbia University Law School. This board of inquiry gave every conscientious objector that appeared before it a fair hearing, with the result that many of them changed their minds and accepted service. The final result was that but 504 men had to be court-martialed, so that the martyr crop was small.

It is a remarkable fact that without any direct knowledge of what the other country was doing both England and the United States finally evolved practically the same method of dealing with conscientious objectors. England drafted a larger number of men into her army than did the United States, and there were 6,135 conscientious objectors in that country who refused to perform combatant service. The British military authorities promptly tried 5,596 of these by court-martial, many tales of severe and brutal treatment were told, with the result that Parliament appointed a committee, headed by Mr. Brice, undersecretary of the Home Office, to investigate conditions. This committee proceeded to test out the sincerity of the objectors. Four thousand six hundred and forty-six were found to be sincere in their convictions, leaving but 950, who were punished by confinement in prison as recalcitrants.

But little blame can attach to a patriotic soldier when he sees another man who has been called to the colors deliberately refuse to perform his full duty as a soldier. Resentment was bound to arise which would not take time to ask questions or discuss religious beliefs. His first instinct was to compel obedience by force. Wisdom therefore directed that wherever conscientious objectors were found to be sincere in their convictions the military duty which such persons should be required to perform should be determined by a civilian tribunal and not by the military authorities. England and the United States each reached the same conclusion in this matter, and both countries solved the problem in the same way.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. I have not much sympathy with the conscientious objectors.

Mr. HAYDEN. Neither have I; particularly with the anarchists, socialists, I. W. W.'s, and pro-Germans who were against this war.

Mr. CARTER. But was not one of the greatest soldiers, one of the greatest fighters that we had in the war, a conscientious objector?

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman refers to Sergt. Alvin York, who was given a certificate by his local board that he was a member of a church whose tenets were opposed to war. Sergt. York never presented that certificate to the military authorities, but went into the Army without objection and made a magnificent fighting record.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Do I understand the gentleman and that side of the House to defend the position of the Secretary of War and the President of the United States in reference to the policy pursued toward the so-called conscientious objectors?

Mr. HAYDEN. I certainly do. The War Department acted wisely and well in handling a most difficult problem, which was unprecedented in this country, because our Government had never before attempted to draft into service nearly 3,000,000 men, many of them against their will. If brutal treatment had been handed out to these individual conscientious objectors, if they had been turned over to the military authorities and forced to do combatant service when they had a firm religious conviction against it, the Secretary of War would have made martyrs by the hundreds. Such a policy would have created popular sympathy for these objectors, there would have been a reaction in their favor, and Congress would have been compelled to take action in their behalf, just as the British Parliament did when the Brice committee was appointed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Was not Sergt. York a really red-blooded American and not in the class of these yellow slackers the gentleman has referred to?

Mr. HAYDEN. I classify Sergt. York with thousands of other good men who went away from their local boards with certificates of conscientious objection, but who soon saw that if America was to live Germany must be defeated.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. At least Sergt. York fought while these other fellows shirked.

Mr. HAYDEN. He and a great many other men who possessed certificates that they were entitled to exemption from combatant service went to Europe and fought the Hun to the finish.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And I take off my hat to Sergt. York.

Mr. HAYDEN. And so do I; he has justly earned the high respect of every true American.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman ought not to classify him with these other fellows.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me express the hope that the special committee now investigating the conduct of the war against Germany will take early opportunity to thoroughly and impartially examine into the facts relative to the treatment of conscientious objectors in the Army. The American people are entitled to know the truth, and when the whole truth is made known I am satisfied that the verdict will be that the President of the United States and the Secretary of War do not deserve the censure of those who do not know, or do not want to know, the truth. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

By unanimous consent Mr. HAYDEN was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California yields 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], and asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter that I have written to a constituent upon his appeal for clemency in behalf of conscientious objectors. I believe it to be relevant to the subject matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

Owing to the number of letters which he has received urging his cooperation in securing the release of conscientious objectors now in confinement in the United States, Congressman ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN is of the opinion that a systematically planned propaganda is in progress.

To the letter of Mr. William L. Palmer, 453 East One hundred and sixtieth Street, which is a fair sample of the letters received, the Congressman has sent the following reply:

"DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 1st instant, expressing your solicitude for the 'immediate release of conscientious objectors' duly received. I can not join you in your anxiety, nor can I agree with you that 'it is reasonable to assume that if everyone took the position these men have taken there could be no more war.' Such a hypothesis is preposterous.

"It is utterly unthinkable that 'everyone' is likely to take the position of hostility to war. Such a possibility is only realizable in the millennium, which is still quite far distant.

BURDEN ON OTHER MAN SELFISH.

"In our present age even the most peaceably inclined must recognize the necessity for self-defense so long as powerful nations persist in huge armaments and gigantic preparations for possible aggressions upon their weaker neighbors. For any man to take the stand that the defense of his home and country should fall upon the shoulders of others, while he is permitted to pursue his usual vocation without contributing his share to the common welfare, is the most dastardly and dangerous form of egotism and selfishness.

"Such men are a menace to the land they live in, and to discharge them now, with bouquets and compliments, after 4,000,000 of the loyal and patriotic sons of America have faithfully performed their duty—200,000 of them offering up their lives—would be an unforgivable injustice.

"Your statement that 'these men have committed no crime, for it has never been established that refusing to take life is a crime,' is a quaint but nevertheless dangerous combination of sophistry and moral blindness. On the contrary, these men committed the greatest crime in the whole category of human offenses. They refused to defend their country. The latter part of your statement, that 'it has never been established that refusing to take life is a crime,' conceals the most dangerous sophistry in that it flies to the Ten Commandments for the defense of cowardice, and outwits the devil in quoting Scripture. Even the most pious and loyal of devotees of the Scriptures have never claimed that the moral law was broken by taking life to defend life. The law of self-defense is well established. No one but a coward or a crank can justly claim that he shows his devotion to religion by refusing to help prevent the destruction of his fellow citizens by a foreign power or the impairment of his country's rights and liberties.

"Yours, very truly,

"ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to certain remarks made in the Senate on Friday last. I refer to pages 2811 and 2814. There was a discussion in the Senate, and the result would indicate they sought to blame the House of Representatives for the present condition of the Air Service. After complaining of the present condition in the Air Service, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate, when Senator FALL remarked that the department was not to be blamed for the conditions in the Air Service, said:

I interject the observation that it can hardly be said that it is the fault of the Senate.

Whereupon the papers throughout the country in editorials blamed the House of Representatives for the condition in the Air Service, owing to the cut in the appropriation. With all due respect to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, I am sure that if he blames the House Appropriations Committee for the present condition—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from New York in proceeding to criticize another body is out of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am not criticizing another body. I am justifying the judgment of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas). The gentleman will proceed without reference to the action taken in another body.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I wish to point out that the House appropriated \$25,000,000 for the Air Service for the year 1919-20 and \$25,000,000 for the Air Service of the Navy. That makes \$50,000,000 in all. First, according to the estimates submitted by the Navy in respect to the way they intended spending the money, it is not possible for the Navy to spend \$25,000,000 during the present fiscal year. Some of the projects for which they ask this money can not be performed within the present fiscal year. The Army has not fixed any definite program, and that is why we cut down to \$25,000,000 the amount they asked—\$83,000,000. They intend building a dirigible and certain planes, and the specifications and the drawings for them do not yet exist. The \$25,000,000 which we appropriated for them under present existing conditions can not possibly be spent during the present fiscal year. We did cut about fourteen or fifteen million dollars that the Army wanted, with which to buy land, and that is why certain gentlemen perhaps are peeved at this time. They wanted \$3,000,000 to buy a field at Dayton, Ohio. I will give you the details of that land grab in a minute. In order to sugar that they put in \$980,000 to buy some land in Buffalo and \$3,000,000 more to buy land in New Jersey. There is about \$9,000,000 they want for land alone, and it would take \$10,000,000 to put the buildings on that land. This has nothing to do with the condition of the Air Service. The land they wanted to buy in New Jersey would take at least a year before it would be in condition to be used as an aviation field or as a field for dirigibles.

Then the distinguished Senator, and I am not criticizing but merely want to point out what was said, remarked that there was some comment on the sale of \$22,000,000 worth of airplanes to the Curtiss people for \$2,000,000. It seems an effort is made to justify this sale, and he says the planes were no good, "that they did not want to sell them to individuals, because they would crash," and then he said the Curtiss Co.—

Mr. BANKHEAD. To what Senator does the gentleman refer?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. To the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed without discussing the attitude of Senators.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am not discussing the attitude of Senators, but I am reading from the RECORD. The RECORD shows that "the Curtiss Co. agreed to take a certain number, just as they run, and to get them out of the country," and as it appears from the RECORD of the Senate, "to let somebody else do the crashing." That statement perhaps was meant to be funny, but it is as unsportsmanlike and as unsoldierly as it is incorrect. We want to develop our aircraft industry. Surely that is no way to commence advertising our export trade.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not a fact that the size of the personnel of the Air Service is not affected one way or the other by the size of the special appropriation for the Air Service to which the gentleman has been referring?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Absolutely not.

Mr. MONDELL. And that, therefore, any statement to the effect that it has been necessary to reduce the personnel of the Air Service because this particular appropriation was reduced is not correct?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman states it exactly. I will come to that in a minute. As to the question of these planes being sent out of the country, that is not the fact, because the Curtiss people are selling a large number of these planes in this country. As to their saying it is all junk, that is not correct, because I was informed to-day they are flying those planes off the field. As to saying that somebody else could do the crashing, if it were true that somebody else was going to do the crashing we should not sell them abroad. This country's industries put a guaranty on its exports. If the planes were junk for us they would be junk for anyone else. If they would crash here they could not be sold anywhere. Even if they were they would still bring more than 10 per cent of the cost price of \$22,000,000. That simply goes to show how accurate were the statements of this particular discussion.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not just now. Now, as to the personnel, the Secretary testified before the committee yesterday, as did the Chief of Staff, that it is possible to transfer officers to the Air Service, to take fliers who desire to remain in the service and attach them to the Infantry and detail them to the Air Service. They have vacancies in the Infantry even if under the present ratio allowed Air Service, which is purely arbitrary, too small an allotment has been made. I hold in my hand, and which I shall insert in the RECORD, a letter under date of July 2, which shows there were 10 men in the Air Service promoted to be colonels and lieutenant colonels, only one of whom is a flying officer, and he has seen no service overseas during the war. If you are going to fill up the Air Service with favorites and relatives, regardless of the need of the service, you can not expect the best blood of this country, for such were our young fliers, to remain in the service. I charge that none of the men promoted has any special technical qualifications to carry out the work of that service, and so places are filled with high ranking officers and the technical work will necessarily have to be done by junior officers who ought to be on flying duty.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. HULINGS. I desire to ask the gentleman if he knows of any Regular Army officer who flew as a pilot?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, yes. What the gentleman wants to ask is how many Regular Army officers flew over the lines?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Gen Mitchell, who has a splendid record, and three or four others.

Mr. HULINGS. Three or four. I saw a statement that gave the appropriations made, and it stated that there was no flying force at all and only 232 officers in the service and that all of those were needed for administrative purposes. If we have no flying department, what is the need of administrative officers?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The administrative work is the easiest of all. Anybody can do that. The technical and flying branches require special trained and picked men. If they had 232 real fliers, that would take care of several squadrons needed at this time. Now, I introduced a resolution calling upon the Air Service to render a commercial inventory of what they had. They do not know what they have got. They can not tell us how many motors they have or about how many hours those motors have been used or how much material they have on hand. At the time they sold those \$22,000,000 worth of planes they did not know whether they were old or junk. That is how the sale must have gone through; they apparently did not know the condition of those planes. Somebody is responsible, and I hope to locate the responsibility.

Now, going back to the land, the Aviation Service has a field at Dayton, Ohio, known as McCook's Field. This field was owned or controlled by certain gentlemen who were in the Air Service. They leased it to the city of Dayton, which in turn leased it to the Air Service. The Government spent millions of dollars on this ground improving it, and now these same gentlemen are anxious to have the city of Dayton rescind this lease, so that the property may revert to them greatly enhanced in value. I want to call the House's attention to the fact that the lease from the city of Dayton to the Government does not expire until the 5th day of January, 1927. The property which we were urged to purchase in Dayton, Ohio, is owned by the Moraine Development Co., and my information is that the same gentlemen who own the other tract of land are trying to sell the new land to the Government. The average assessed value of this land is \$85 an acre. The price offered to the Government is away in excess of this. I will have more details in a few days and will inform the House. Anyone can see through this deal, and certainly had we spent \$3,000,000 to please these gentlemen we would not have increased the Aviation Service with a single plane or done anything to develop the industry in this country. The tract of land in New Jersey is absolutely undeveloped; \$3,000,000 was asked for it. It would take over a year to get that into condition, and that would in no way improve the present conditions in the Air Service. Nine hundred and eighty thousand dollars was asked for the land in Buffalo. The only argument I heard for this land was that it was adjacent to buildings in which the Government had put in several million dollars, and these buildings are now used to store motor trucks. Again, I ask the House if there is anything in this that would improve our Air Service? The House saw through this and, judiciously in its policy of economy, cut down the appropriation.

I want to take this opportunity to point out that I have found my committee and the membership of this House eager, anxious, and willing to do everything within reason to develop a great Air Service and aeronautical industry in this country.

The trouble with the Air Service is, as I have stated so many times on the floor of this House, it has had so much money in the past, that it has squandered and wasted so much, so many favorites have grown rich, that all about the air has been forgotten and now that they have squandered a billion of dollars and have to admit that they have not even planes for duty in certain places where they may be required, of course, it is sought to blame the House for lack of appropriation. Why, if we had appropriated another \$640,000,000 the Air Service would be no better off than it is.

We must give American industry a chance to develop, and certainly there is no chance to develop as long as money is wasted on land projects or spent for machines in Europe. As an immediate remedy for present deplorable conditions in the Army Air Service I recommend that as many of the reserve pilots who were engaged in flying in Europe and in this country should desire to remain in the service, either permanently or temporarily, be given commissions and assigned to the Air Service until such time as an independent service is created and a sufficient number of men and officers provided for it. That all purchases of land be stopped and a definite program be adopted for the purchase of machines made in America. This is the way to develop American aeronautical industry. That proper, competent officers who have had experience in aviation and who have made good as flying officers in the war be placed in charge of the Army Air Service. [Applause.]

WAR DEPARTMENT, AIR SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. LAGUARDIA: Replying to your letter of June 26, in which you ask that you be furnished name, rank, prior service, and record in the Air Service of all officers above the rank of captain in the Air Service who have been promoted within the last 90 days, the information you desire follows.

Delay in replying to your communication has been occasioned by obtaining the complete records of the officers concerned:

Promoted to major.

CAPT. JOHN W. SWANN.

Military record before entering Air Service: One and four-twelfths years Company M, Twenty-third United States Infantry, and 15 years Philippine Constabulary.

Military record after entering Air Service: Commissioned captain, Aviation Section, Signal Reserve Corps, August 22, 1917.

CAPT. JAMES J. NEWMAN.

Military record before entering Air Service: None.

Military record after entering Air Service: Commissioned captain, Signal Corps, from civil life, October 27, 1917.

CAPT. ALVIN C. REIS.

Military record before entering Air Service: None.

Military record after entering Air Service: Commissioned first lieutenant, Aviation Section, Signal Reserve Corps, from candidates reserve officers' training camp, November 17, 1917. Promoted to captain, Air Service, November 1, 1918.

CAPT. HENRY J. WHITEHOUSE.

Military record before entering Air Service: Appointed Plattsburg Training Camp summers of 1915 and 1916.

Military record after entering Air Service: Commissioned captain, Aviation Section, Signal Reserve Corps, from reserve officers' training camp, Plattsburg Barracks, November, 1917.

Promoted to lieutenant colonel.

MAJ. JAMES E. CHANEY.

Military record before entering Air Service: Cadet, United States Military Academy, 1904-1908; second lieutenant, Infantry, October 14, 1908; first lieutenant, Infantry, June 20, 1914; captain, Infantry, March 22, 1917.

Military record after entering Air Service: Appointed major, Signal Corps, September 22, 1917; executive officer, Chanute Field, Rantoul, Ill., November 5, 1917; commanding officer school of military aeronautics, University of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, November 10, 1917, to January 6, 1918; executive officer, Operations Division, Division of Military Aeronautics, January 7, 1918, to August 8, 1918; overseas since September 3, 1918.

MAJ. HORACE M. HICKAM.

Military record before entering Air Service: Cadet, United States Military Academy, 1904-1908; second lieutenant, Cavalry, February 14, 1908; first lieutenant, Cavalry, December 8, 1914; captain, Cavalry, May 15, 1917.

Military record after entering Air Service: Major, Signal Corps, August 5, 1917; executive officer, aviation concentration depot, Garden City, N. Y., to May 8, 1918; flying instructor and athletic supervisor, Rockwell Field, San Diego, Calif., May 17, 1918, to September 12, 1918; executive officer and commanding officer Carlstrom Field, Arcadia, Fla., September 18, 1918, to January, 1919; chief, information group, since January, 1919.

Promoted to colonel.

LIEUT. COL. JAMES A. MARS.

Military record before entering Air Service: Cadet, United States Military Academy, 1899-1903; first lieutenant, Cavalry, March 11, 1911; captain, Cavalry, July 1, 1916.

Military record after entering Air Service: Appointed major, Signal Corps, November 28, 1917; on duty with Personnel Division, Division of Military Aeronautics, to January 1, 1918; commanding officer aviation general supply depot, Fairfield, Ohio, January 3, 1918, to November 12, 1918; promoted to lieutenant colonel February 26, 1918; officer in charge of demobilization of Air Service troops, November 14, 1918, to December 12, 1918; appointed Director Bureau of Aircraft Production December 19, 1919; on duty as such since that date.

LIEUT. COL. WILLIAM F. PEARSON.

Military record before entering Air Service: Private, corporal, sergeant, Twenty-eighth Battery, Field Artillery, 1902-1904; second lieutenant, Infantry, October 5, 1904; first lieutenant, Infantry, March 11, 1911; captain, Infantry, July 1, 1916.

Military record after entering Air Service: Appointed major, Signal Corps, August 5, 1917; commanded United States School of Military Aeronautics, Champaign, Ill., to May 8, 1918; promoted to lieutenant colonel February 26, 1918; executive officer Washington branch, Air Service Production Center, American Expeditionary Forces, May 8, 1918, to August 22, 1918; commanding officer aviation general supply depot, San Antonio, Tex., August 25, 1918, to December 17, 1918; chief, Finance Division, Air Service, December 19, 1918, to January 10, 1919; administrative executive, Air Service, since January 10, 1919.

LIEUT. COLONEL OSCAR WESTOVER.

Military record before entering Air Service: Private, Company K, United States Engineers, 1901-1902; cadet, United States Military Academy, 1902-1906; second lieutenant, Infantry, January 12, 1906; first lieutenant, Infantry, April 13, 1911; captain, Infantry, July 1, 1916.

Military record after entering Air Service: Detailed in Signal Corps, September 12, 1917; promoted to major, November 20, 1917; promoted to lieutenant colonel August 14, 1918; on duty as signal officer, port of embarkation, Hoboken, N. J., September 26, 1917, to March 19, 1918; officer in charge supply depots, Washington, D. C., March 19, 1918, to May 10, 1918; chief of storage and traffic department, Bureau Aircraft Production, and officer in charge of acceptance parks, also assistant executive, Procurement Division, General Staff, January 10, 1918, to November 18, 1918; assistant to Acting Director of Aircraft Production, November 19, 1918, to January 2, 1919; assistant executive, Air Service, January 2, 1919, to January 30, 1919.

Very truly, yours,

CHAS. T. MENOHER,
Major General, United States Army,
Director of Air Service.

Hon. F. H. LA GUARDIA,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], a member of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on last Wednesday, when bill No. 3754, to amend the copyright act, was called up by the chairman of the Committee on Patents, he made a very able statement in regard to the bill, but in view of the fact that there are many present to-day who were not here at that time, and also in view of the fact that considerable interest and desire for information was manifested by the number of questions propounded by Members of the House, the chairman has suggested that I make a statement in regard to the provisions and purposes of this bill. In the first place, I will say that the occasion for the need of this legislation grows out of war conditions.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order. I think we ought to have more than 50 men in the House in the consideration of a bill as important as this, and I make the point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum, and evidently, there is not.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ashbrook	Evans, Nev.	Kettner	Sabath
Barkley	Fairfield	Kincheloe	Sanders, La.
Bee	Ferris	King	Sanders, N. Y.
Benson	Flood	Kinkaid	Sanford
Bland, Ind.	Frear	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Britten	Ganly	Lever	Sells
Brooks, Ill.	Godwin, N. C.	Linthicum	Siegel
Browne	Goldfogle	McAndrews	Sims
Burdick	Goodall	McClintie	Slomp
Burke	Goodykoontz	McCulloch	Small
Butler	Gould	McKiniry	Smith, N. Y.
Caldwell	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Snyder
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Merritt	Steagall
Candler	Green, Iowa	Miller	Steele
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Vt.	Neely	Stevenson
Classon	Griest	Newton, Mo.	Sullivan
Cooper	Hamill	O'Connor	Taylor, Ark.
Copley	Hamilton	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Crago	Haskell	Olney	Thompson, Okla.
Crisp	Haugen	Paige	Tilman
Currie, Mich.	Hersman	Parker	Tilson
Dale	Hicks	Porter	Towner
Davis, Minn.	Houghton	Purnell	Vare
Dempsey	Howard	Ragsdale	Venable
Denison	Huddleston	Rainey, H. T.	Webb
Dickinson, Mo.	Hull, Tenn.	Reavis	Whaley
Donovan	Husted	Reed, N. Y.	Wheeler
Doughton	Johnson, Miss.	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, Pa.
Dupré	Jones, Pa.	Riordan	Wingo
Dyer	Jones, Tex.	Robinson, N. C.	Winslow
Echols	Kahn	Robison, Ky.	Woodyard
Ellsworth	Kelley, Mich.	Rouse	
Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 291 Members have answered present. The Sergeant at Arms will open the doors.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call. Now that everybody else is here except the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who made the point of no quorum, I think we can proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted I had just explained that the necessity for this law grew out of war conditions, because of the fact that the facilities for transportation of books between the United States and foreign countries and the almost impossibility of publishing books during the war in countries other than those in which the authors resided amounted to a practical suspension of American authors obtaining copyright protection in England and other foreign countries, and it had the same result with respect to foreign authors obtaining copyrights in the United States. Diplomatic correspondence between our Government and the British Government resulted in a proposal from the British Government that the United States Congress enact a law amending the copyright law along the lines embodied in this proposed bill, and they promised a British order in council granting similar privileges and protection to American authors in return.

The Committee on Patents held hearings on this bill and undertook to very carefully consider it from every viewpoint, and the

chairman of the committee received a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, in which he not only indorsed the bill but urged its passage. Furthermore, the secretary of the Authors' League of America, who also represented the Incorporated Society of Authors, Playwrights, and Composers, containing about 3,600 members, and the American Publishers' Copyright League, appeared before the committee and urged the passage of this bill. Furthermore, Mr. Solberg, the register of copyrights of the Library of Congress, appeared before the committee and urged the passage of the bill. We were further advised that the bill had been submitted to representatives of organized labor, and that they have likewise given it their sanction, because this law does not change the present provision requiring that foreign books shall be published in the United States before they are entitled to copyright protection.

We knew of no opposition from any source. We could learn of none on the committee, and all the members of the Committee on Patents who were present voted that the bill be favorably reported for passage.

Now, I shall undertake to briefly explain the provisions of the bill. It proposes to amend sections 8 and 21 of the copyright act approved March 4, 1909. All of section 1, beginning on line 1, page 1, and continuing to the word "Provided," on line 18, page 2, is simply a recitation of the language contained in the original copyright act. The amendatory provision begins at the word "Provided," on line 18, and reads:

Provided, however, That all works made the subject of copyright by the laws of the United States first produced or published abroad after August 1, 1914, and before the date of the President's proclamation of peace, of which the authors or proprietors are citizens or subjects of any foreign State or nation granting similar protection for works by citizens of the United States, the existence of which shall be determined by a copyright proclamation issued by the President of the United States, shall be entitled to the protection conferred by the copyright laws of the United States from and after the accomplishment, before the expiration of 15 months after the date of the President's proclamation of peace, of the conditions and formalities prescribed with respect to such works by the copyright laws of the United States; Provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive any person of any right which he may have acquired by the republication of such foreign work in the United States prior to the approval of this act.

The preceding provisions of that section, and other sections in the original copyright act, provide the manner in which works by foreign authors may be copyrighted in this country; and the only change which is made by this proposed amendment is to protect works which were published in foreign countries during the war—that is, from August 1, 1914—and for 15 months after the proclamation of peace, and permitting them at any time within that period to come in and have their books copyrighted by complying with the regular provisions with respect to obtaining such copyright. In other words, it gives them no additional privileges, but simply extends the time within which foreign publications may be copyrighted so as to cover the period during which conditions have been so greatly disturbed and are still disturbed by war conditions.

Now, the purpose of our Government in desiring to grant this privilege is in order to procure a like privilege from foreign countries. And the Government of Great Britain has already promised to have an order in council made granting the same reciprocal rights to citizens of the United States upon the enactment of such a law by Congress, it not being necessary in England for same to be done by legislative enactment. When that is done by the privy council of Great Britain it will automatically result, as I am advised, that the protection of American books in all other countries will likewise be procured by the action of the Berne International Copyright Union, which includes Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Spain, and Switzerland.

The Assistant Secretary of State—

Mr. CONNALLY. Before you get to that point, will you yield to a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the language in line 24, "the existence of which shall be determined by a copyright proclamation issued by the President of the United States," mean those countries that afford the same rights to American authors that we afford to their authors, or that fact shall be determined?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes, sir. This law we are proposing to enact will not become effective in favor of foreign authors until the President of the United States shall have made proclamation that such right has been accorded by such foreign countries.

Mr. CONNALLY. And naming the countries?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes, sir.

In addition, and in further response to the question of the gentleman from Texas, I wish to read briefly from a letter written by the Acting Secretary of State, Frank L. Polk, under date of June 24, to the chairman of the Committee on Patents.

After referring to this bill and some preliminary matters, he adds this:

As of possible interest to you, it may be stated that the British Government has proposed to this Government an arrangement for such reciprocal protection for works of American and British authors published during the war.

It appears that under the proposed arrangement greater benefits will result to citizens of this country than will be obtained by British subjects, due to the fact that during the war the British Government was obliged to impose an embargo against importation of books, and, owing to other war causes, it was extremely difficult for American authors to obtain publication of their works in Great Britain within 14 days after publication in this country, as required by the British copyright law.

The existing law in England provides that before a copyright can be obtained by an American or other foreign author in England the book must be published in Great Britain within 14 days after its publication in this country or other foreign country, as the case may be. This, you will note, extends it for 15 months after the proclamation of peace. Now, in that connection I wish to explain to the Members of the House that before a copyright is granted by our Government to a citizen or subject of a foreign country our law requires that the foreign book must be actually printed in this country, within the confines of the United States, for sale and distribution, whereas the British law does not require that an American book shall be published in the sense of being printed in England or in Great Britain before it is entitled to the right of copyright. It simply requires that it shall be published in the sense of being placed on sale. However, the American authors and publishers say that it is frequently physically impossible to get American books to England and place them actually on sale within two weeks after their publication in the United States; and there is another amendment curing that defect, to which I shall later refer if my time does not expire.

Now, continuing the reading of the letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, he further states:

As the proposed amendment is intended to provide protection for American citizens who otherwise would forfeit valuable property rights as a result of the interference with transportation and communication, due to the war, it is believed that enactment of the measure will be advantageous to American citizens and will materially assist in the promotion of cordial and friendly relations with the various foreign Governments concerned.

So far as the protection of American interests abroad and the international relations of the United States are concerned, the pending bill has the sanction of this department.

In this connection, gentlemen, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the trading-with-the-enemy act suspended during the period of the war the requirement that works from our enemies—Germany, Austria, and so forth—must be presented within the time provided by the regular act. In other words, they have the right under the trading-with-the-enemy act to come in after the proclamation of peace and have all of their works which were published during the war given the copyright protection under our law. This bill is simply to extend to the countries of our Allies and their citizens the privilege which already exists by law with respect to our alien enemies. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACCRATE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the committee, in order that you may have some idea of the actual number of books published in America on which copyrights have not been obtainable because of war conditions I asked the register of copyrights in the Congressional Library to give me some figures. In 1914 there were 29,704 American books copyrighted, and from that time until the present time the number has been annually increasing, so that in 1918 and 1919 the total number of American books copyrighted was 36,615, making a grand total for the five years from 1914 to 1919 of 162,739 American books which have been copyrighted. During the war copyrights in foreign countries practically ceased, and the purpose of this bill, although it appears to give foreign authors the right of copyright in America, is actually intended to give American authors the right of copyright in foreign lands.

Now, with reference to books of foreign authors copyrighted during the war period I would say that from 1914 to 1919 there has been a total of 6,963 foreign books copyrighted in this country, as against a total of 12,589 books in the period from 1909 to 1914. That is, during the war foreign copyrights have fallen off about 40 per cent. This bill simply extends 15 months of grace whereby an author on the other side will have time in which to copyright his book on this side. It does not, however, interfere with any right which an American has gained by republishing those copyrighted works before this bill passes.

There is a proviso expressly excluding from the operation of the law those books that have been published in America during the period of the war.

The history of copyright legislation is very interesting, especially so far as the manufacturing clause is concerned. In section 21, which we also amend by this act, we provide for an extension of from 30 to 60 days, the ad interim protection, and an extension of 30 days to 4 months in which a man can republish his work in America. There were 100,000 books published in England from the time of the enactment of our law in 1909, and yet only 1 per cent of all these English books was actually reprinted in America, and the reason given for this small percentage of reprinting and republishing of English-language books in America was the fact that we did not allow sufficient time in which the English author could have his work reprinted and rebound to gain American copyright.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACCRATE. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether Russia was to be included in this legislation, and whether it had in view the admission of Russian books?

Mr. MACCRATE. As I understand, Russia was not a member of the Berne conference held in 1885.

Mr. McKEOWN. Is there anything in our copyright laws relative to the nature and character of the books that may be copyrighted here?

Mr. MACCRATE. The gentleman suggests something that ran through the minds of certain other Members of this House. The copyright law, while it does specify that certain documents may be copyrighted, in no wise goes to the thing that the gentleman probably refers to, namely, Bolshevism and other books inculcating similar ideas, any more than it does to American books of similar purport.

Mr. McKEOWN. That is what I wondered about, whether or not under this bill more freedom would be given to writers whose works we have had occasion to wish were not published in this country.

Mr. MACCRATE. While that may be legislation that is desirable under the copyright law, I am afraid it would not be possible. It would require a force and corps of censors which we could not afford and which, I believe, the spirit of America would not tolerate.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, I may say that this right of copyright does not entitle a book to circulation unless it is otherwise entitled to circulation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACCRATE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think it is time in America for Congress to make provision in such a law as this for placing some kind of restriction on the publication of books which tend to promote anarchy in this country?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is that a function of the Committee on Patents, or does it go to a higher authority?

Mr. BLANTON. It is the function of copyright.

Mr. MACCRATE. I would say, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], that we need have no fear of the contamination of the American mind by the publication of books, and I believe that if American authorities will provide funds in the cities and in the States for the proper compensation of the teachers of America, who instruct the youth of America, we need have no fear of a Russian Bolshevik propaganda or any other propaganda.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the reason why we have this anarchistic propaganda in this country is that we can not keep enough men here to get through the legislation that we ought to pass. I think we ought to have at least 50 men present, and I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum.

Mr. MACCRATE. Will the gentleman reserve that right for a moment?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order until the gentleman from New York has finished his remarks?

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. MACCRATE. Gentlemen, with reference to copyright books, there are 162,000 American books published since the war began, most of which have not been copyrighted in foreign countries. In 1837 American authors first sought to have an international copyright law enacted in America. Henry Clay introduced the resolution in the House. Since then authors have always contended that there should be a republic of letters, and that, with a suitable international copyright law,

American authors could interpret America to Europe. It may truly be said that American authors have done much to give other lands a proper understanding of this Nation, and with these 162,000 volumes they may do more; but may I suggest to you that the interpretation of American ideals no longer depends on the authors of America. Our boys, 2,000,000 strong, not by books in any copyright office in Europe, but as living epistles on the fields of France, have interpreted forever the real spirit of America. Seventy thousand sealed volumes of American youth, each of hardly 25 yearly pages, laid away on the earthy shelves of foreign soil, are the silent witnesses to the world that America has a soul. [Applause.] And may I further say that while some foreign books come here which perhaps ought not to be copyrighted, in the district from which I come and the great city of which we are a part we have a population made in large part of men who have come from foreign countries, whose sons have gone with native sons to the other side carrying the arms and under the flag of America, and have interpreted real Americanism better than some American-born Bolsheviks ever will do it, no matter what books they publish. [Applause.] In my district, comprising only 7 square miles, we have 17 languages spoken; yet when the draft law was enacted in one local board only one man claimed to be a conscientious objector. We sent for him as members of the board and inquired what he objected to conscientiously. His name did not suggest a conscientious objector, and he said, jokingly, "I have been hearing about conscientious objectors, but the only conscientious objection I have is to being shot." [Laughter.]

Of 3,700 young men whose names were listed in the first draft in that board, 2,000 were born outside of the United States, and only 1,700 were born in the United States. The fifth man on that list was a lad named Sylvestre Cucciari, an Italian without citizenship papers. We said to him, "Sylvestre, do you want to claim exemption?" He said, "No; I am going back to Italy to show them how much I love America." Sylvestre Cucciari went to the other side. He is now numbered with the 70,000 the books of whose lives were marked "Finis" on Flanders fields, and on him and them, native and foreign born, America has stamped forever her "Copyright."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to consider the bill I think we ought to have a quorum. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Obviously no quorum is present.

Mr. NOLAN. I move a call of the House. In the meantime I suggest to the gentleman from Texas who makes the point of no quorum that he stay here.

Mr. BLANTON. I have been here all day and every day this session, I will say to the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. No debate is in order. The question is on ordering a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ashbrook	Crago	Ganly	Johnson, S. Dak.
Ayres	Crisp	Gard	Jones, Pa.
Bacharach	Currie, Mich.	Godwin, N. C.	Jones, Tex.
Barkley	Davey	Goldfogle	Kearns
Bee	Davis, Minn.	Goodall	Kelley, Mich.
Benham	Dempsey	Goodykoontz	Kelly, Pa.
Benson	Denison	Gould	Kendall
Bland, Ind.	Dickinson, Mo.	Graham, Pa.	Kennedy, Iowa
Boohar	Donovan	Green, Iowa	Kennedy, R. I.
Bowers	Doremus	Griest	Kettner
Britten	Doughton	Hadley	Kincheloe
Brooks, Ill.	Dunn	Hamill	King
Browne	Dyer	Hamilton	Lampert
Browning	Echols	Haskell	Larsen
Brumbaugh	Ellsworth	Hawley	Lee, Ga.
Burdick	Elston	Hays	Leibach
Burke	Esch	Hicks	Lever
Caldwell	Evans, Mont.	Hill	Longworth
Candler	Evans, Nev.	Hulings	Luhning
Carew	Fairfield	Hull, Iowa	McArthur
Casey	Ferris	Hull, Tenn.	McClintic
Coady	Fields	Humphreys	McCulloch
Cole	Focht	Husted	McKenzie
Cooper	Fordney	Ireland	McKinley
Copley	Frear	Johnson, Ky.	McKinley
Costello	Gallagher	Johnson, Miss.	Maher

Major	Ragsdale	Small	Towner
Mason	Reavis	Smith, N. Y.	Treadway
Merritt	Reed, N. Y.	Snell	Vare
Miller	Reed, W. Va.	Snyder	Venable
Montague	Riordan	Stengall	Voigt
Mott	Robinson, N. C.	Steele	Ward
Mudd	Robison, Ky.	Stephens, Miss.	Watson, Pa.
Neely	Rouse	Stevens, Ohio	Webb
Nelson, Wis.	Rowan	Stinson	Wheeler
Newton, Mo.	Rucker	Sullivan	Wilson, Ill.
O'Connor	Sabath	Sweet	Wilson, Pa.
Olney	Sanders, Ind.	Taylor, Ark.	Wingo
Paige	Sanders, La.	Taylor, Tenn.	Winslow
Parker	Scully	Thompson, Ohio	Woodward
Porter	Siegel	Thompson, Okla.	Young, N. Dak.
Pou	Sims	Tilson	
Purnell	Sinnott	Timberlake	
Radcliffe	Slemp		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 257 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 12, insert after the word "book" the word "first."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. NOLAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE RAGSDALE.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. J. WILLARD RAGSDALE, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The Clerk read the following further resolution:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 24, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting information relative to the connection of certain of the department's employees with the case of Thomas J. Mooney (H. Doc. No. 157); to the Committee on Labor and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, requesting the authorizing of an expenditure up to the amount of \$500,000 to fight forest fires in Idaho (H. Doc. No. 158); to the Committee on the Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a proposed bill authorizing the use of radio stations under the control of the Navy Department for commercial purpose (H. Doc. No. 159); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 288) for the purpose of conferring citizenship upon Indians, segregation of Indian tribal property, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 144), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FESS, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4438) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 145), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SELLS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills of the House, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 7775) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and to certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, accompanied by a report (No. 146), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolution, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 7737) to amend an act approved October 3, 1913, entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 7738) to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules and generally to regulate pleadings, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 7739) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jersey City, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hoboken, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7741) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Weehawken, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7742) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of North Bergen, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Secaucus, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7744) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Guttenberg, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7745) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West New York, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7746) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Hoboken, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7747) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Union, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 7748) to prevent discrimination on the part of life insurance companies against their policyholders who have entered or shall enter the military or naval services of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 7749) for the retirement of officers holding National Army commissions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 7750) to amend section 110, first session Sixty-fourth Congress, United States Statutes at Large, act approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 7751) authorizing the sale of inherited and unpartitioned allotments for town-site purposes in the Quapaw Agency, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7752) relating to detached service of officers of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7753) to repeal an act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," approved July 26, 1911; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 7754) providing for advances to the reclamation fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULINGS: Resolution (H. Res. 192) requesting the United States Food Administration to inform the House of Representatives whether the limitation of sale of sugar is necessary at this time, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 193) requesting the Food Director to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information in regard to the wheat purchased by the Food Administration, and other information connected therewith; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Resolution (H. Res. 194) that the Judiciary Committee be directed to report to the House whether the President, by and with the advice and consent of the United States Senate, can negotiate treaties with foreign governments, which by the Constitution of the United States is vested solely in Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARSS: Resolution (H. Res. 195) authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee of five to investigate the losses and the advisability of extending aid to the district which was devastated by the forest fires of October 12, 1918, in northern Minnesota; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 196) to amend Rule XXI; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHALEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 158) authorizing the Secretary of Labor to lease the Charleston immigration station and dock connected therewith; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 23) appointing a special commission to arrange a price for the sale of the ships owned by the United States Shipping Board or its subsidiaries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Memorial of the Legislature of Texas, regarding title to Mexican bancos or cut-offs situated on and adjacent to the Texas side of the Rio Grande and assuming and claiming jurisdiction over the same under treaty of 1907 between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 7755) granting an increase of pension to Jane L. Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7756) granting an increase of pension to George P. Mayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 7757) granting an increase of pension to Harry C. Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7758) to correct the military record of George S. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7759) granting an increase of pension to Martha Timoney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 7760) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Mulcahy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7761) granting a pension to John C. McDowell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7762) granting an increase of pension to James N. Seip; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7763) granting an increase of pension to Charles Apple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 7764) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Holley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7765) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7766) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 7767) to appoint Admiral William S. Benson, United States Navy, and Rear Admiral William S. Sims, United States Navy, as permanent admirals in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 7768) authorizing the President to appoint Col. Orin B. Mitcham a brigadier general on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 7769) granting a pension to Virgil M. Wolf; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7770) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Weddel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7771) granting a pension to George W. Bratcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7772) granting a pension to John Nicholas Sharp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 7773) granting a pension to Edward L. Hayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7774) granting an increase of pension to John W. Houtze; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 157) to grant amnesty to Charles A. McAnally, private in the United States Army and a member of the United States Engineers, restoring him to his pay and his position in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of Polish Alma Mater and the Polish Publishing Co., both of Chicago, Ill., opposing Senate bill 2099; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Slovenic National Benefit Society, No. 178, opposing bill prohibiting admission to the mails of the United States publications printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Auburn Grange, No. 956, of Crawford County, Ohio, protesting against the Mondell bill or the Lane reclamation bill (H. R. 487); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of numerous residents of the city of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the continuance of the daylight-saving plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of citizens of Columbus, Ohio, on behalf of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of industrial medicine and surgery section of the American Medical Association, recommending an appropriation by Congress to investigate the cause of influenza; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of R. N. Sims, secretary-treasurer National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, for the repeal of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of National Council World War Veterans, of Aurora, Ill., for granting naturalization papers to the foreign born who took up arms in the defense of this country and protecting its flag; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Anti-Tuberculosis Committee of Minneapolis favoring Senate bill 1660 and House bill 3855 and urging a favorable consideration by the committee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Rockford, Ill., urging immediate return of the Twenty-seventh and Thirty-first United States Infantry from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of El Paso Chamber of Commerce protesting bill entitled "An act to define profiteering, to prescribe penalties for violation thereof, and to provide for enforcement of act," by Representative John Davis, Texas State Legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of sundry citizens of Iron Mountain, Mich., for the repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Slovenic National Benefit Society, No. 323, of Ironwood, Mich., against the Byers bill relating to newspapers and magazines, etc., printed in foreign language; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut asking for the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Military Order of the Loyal Legion of New York, urging that the flagship *Hartford* be associated always with the genius and achievements of the Nation's great admiral, Farragut, and with the valor and devotion of his comrades in the important naval operations during the war for the preservation of the Union; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Military Order of the Loyal Legion, urging that the flagship *Hartford* be associated always with the genius and achievements of the Nation's great admiral, Farragut, and with the valor and devotion of his comrades in the important naval operations during the war for the preservation of the Union; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Battle Creek Local, No. 235, N. E. P. E., urging increase in pay for postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 62 citizens of Michigan to repeal tax on patent and proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of Charles E. Hicks, of Endicott, Wash., and others, asking repeal of the "stamp act" as it particularly affects the sale of drugs, medicines, toilet preparations, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of citizens of Worcester, Mass., in re passage of House bill 6810, a bill to prohibit intoxicating beverages, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 24, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for coming more and more out of the shadow into the glorious light and life of the new day. The motives that Thou dost appeal to are the strength of life. The influences of Thy grace constitute life's glory. The revelations of Thy will are the deep and abiding purpose of the living. Grant us this day the influence of Thy spirit that we may discharge as men of God the duties that are upon us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. BRANDEGEE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 23, 1919.

To the Senate:

Through your Secretary, under date of July 17, I am in receipt of copy of a resolution, S. Res. 123.

The resolution calls for a large amount of information regarding details of the work of the Reclamation Service which will take some weeks to secure.

The matter will be taken in hand at once, and report made as requested as soon as possible.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

CURRENCY IN CIRCULATION (S. DOC. NO. 59).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 22, 1919.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the United States of July 8, 1919, transmitted to me by the Secretary of the Senate under date of July 9, I submit the following:

Under the act approved May 30, 1908, commonly known as the Aldrich-Vreeland Act, as amended, additional or emergency currency was issued, beginning on August 4, 1914, in amount \$382,502,645. All of this additional circulation was retired before the close of the calendar year 1915. Authority for the issue of such additional or emergency currency expired by limitation on June 30, 1915.

No emergency currency has been issued by the Federal reserve banks. However, such banks have issued Federal reserve bank notes and Federal reserve notes in accordance with the provisions of law and under the general supervision of the Federal Reserve Board. None were outstanding August 1, 1914. The amounts of such notes in circulation on July 1, 1919, were:

Federal reserve bank notes	\$163,682,696
Federal reserve notes	2,493,992,462

The Treasury Department has no intention, nor, indeed, the power, to retire or withdraw from circulation any thereof, nor, as I am advised, has the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve System was devised to create an elastic currency which would expand and contract automatically in accordance with the requirements of business. Any reduction in the amounts of Federal reserve notes outstanding will be in accordance therewith. Federal reserve bank notes, for the most part, have been issued to replace silver certificates canceled and retired in accordance with the provisions of the act of April 23, 1918.

I transmit herewith a copy of the Treasury Department Circulation Statement for August 1, 1914, and July 1, 1919, showing the amount of money of the United States in circulation on the respective dates. Data are not available in the department with respect to the amount of money in circulation in the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Respectfully,

CARTER GLASS,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication and accompanying paper will lie on the table for the present and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 50,000 copies of the treaty with Germany in the English text alone, and without maps, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3754) to amend sections 8 and 21 of the copyright act, approved March 4, 1909, in which is requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. BRANDEGEE obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	France	Lenroot	Sheppard
Ball	Gay	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gronna	McCormick	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hale	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Harding	McKellar	Smoot
Capper	Harris	Moses	Spencer
Chamberlain	Harrison	Nelson	Stanley
Culberson	Henderson	New	Sterling
Cummins	Hitchcock	Newberry	Sutherland
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Swanson
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Page	Underwood
Elkins	Kling	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Kirby	Polindexter	Warren
Fernald	Knox	Pomerene	Watson
Fletcher	La Follette	Robinson	Williams

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have responded. There is a quorum present.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for about 10 minutes to make a statement regarding a matter that I think is of considerable importance in relation to the pending treaty, if I may have the consent of the Senate to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut will proceed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, on July 10 the President appeared before the Senate and made the following statement. I read from page 2339 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He said:

I shall presently have occasion to lay before you a special treaty with France whose object is the temporary protection of France from unprovoked aggression by the power with whom this treaty of peace has been negotiated. Its terms link it with this treaty. I take the liberty, however, of reserving it, because of its importance, for special explanation on another occasion.

I received this morning through the mail a publication entitled Harvey's Weekly. There is an article on the first page of that publication entitled "President Wilson violates his own treaty." I will read it:

"Does President Wilson regard the Franco-American treaty as a mere scrap of paper? If not, why did he deliberately violate one of its most important provisions within a fortnight after he, as 'President of the United States,' and Mr. Lansing, as 'Secretary of State of the United States,' attached their official signatures to the agreement?"

"That he did that very thing there can be no question. Article 4 of the treaty reads:

"The present treaty will be submitted to the Senate of the United States at the same time as the treaty of Versailles is submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification.

"Submitted by whom? By the President himself, of course, who alone is empowered to submit treaties, who alone with the Secretary of State has a right to sign them, and who with the Secretary of State did sign this one. And it was as 'President of the United States of America' that he entered into this engagement with the duly authorized representatives of the